THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XI JULY, 1925 No. 61

EDITORIAL

THE LIVING CHURCH

It is not often that a little book of sixty pages can carry a message of decisive importance for the whole English Church. Yet it may reasonably be said that this is the case with the two addresses delivered by the Bishop of Southwark to his Synod in May, and now published under the title *Authority and Obedience and Reservation* by the S.P.C.K. (price 8d. net). They are marked as of decisive importance by their circumstance, their manner, and their matter. Their striking circumstance lies in the fact that they were delivered within little more than a fortnight of the publication of "A Call to Action"; and to that publication they constitute a complete and convincing reply. It is a reply in deed as well as in word; for the addresses exhibit not only the mind of the Bishop himself, but beyond and behind it the living Church over which he exercises his pastorate.

It is true that this picture of the living Church is confined for the moment to a single diocese; and that the questions at issue, being such as mainly concern the clergy or concern them in the first place, are discussed between the Bishop and his clergy only, without the laity being present. That, indeed, is of the essence of a Sacred Synod. Bishop and clergy meet as men who have a peculiar commission and call, for which they have been solemnly set apart, and they meet to take counsel together with regard to the discharge of the pastoral office. But these limitations do not affect the great significance of what was said and done. Anglo-Catholics have for long pleaded that the episcopate could not function properly apart from the diocesan synods; synods have met from time to time in different dioceses within the past fifty years; and the principle of synodical action has been recently recommended by a Joint Com-

mittee of the Convocation of Canterbury, and already accepted in the Upper House.* The Southwark Synod, therefore, does not stand alone, but exemplifies a widespread movement.

Nothing, moreover, could have been more admirable than the language in which the Bishop answered the question of authority which had been raised in the manifesto. In regard to doctrine, he says that the Church of England "appeals to the Scriptures and to the faith of the universal Church expressed in the Creeds and in the writings of the Fathers." This does not exclude whatever testing or re-interpretation may be called for by the advance of knowledge and thought; but it does mean that the Church of England is charged with a definite Gospel and Faith, which belongs to the Church Catholic, and which no national Church has authority to mutilate or alter. This assertion of solidarity with the rest of the visible Church is, indeed, plainly affirmed on the title-page of the Prayer Book. To some who signed the "Call to Action" this Catholic Church may be a "nebulous something"; but to the great majority of English Churchmen it is a reality.

The case is different, however, with regard to rites and ceremonies. Here the English Church claims to exercise a discretion such as was frequently exercised by local churches in ancient times, and has been claimed without variation by the Orthodox Churches of the East. The claim is formally embodied, moreover, in the XXXIVth Article of Religion, to which all English priests give their assent at Ordination. To the application of this claim to particular issues now before us we shall pass directly. Meantime, it should be noted that the claim is not one which involves any belief in the infallibility of the Prayer Book. The Prayer Book does not itself claim any finality. It is not a Law-Book (as some would seem to think), but a Prayer Book; and if laws can be changed, much more can forms of prayer. Its standards of worship, moreover, are given us in outline and principle rather than in detail. Strict as to rites, it leaves a large latitude as regards ceremonies. It cuts away the fussiness of the "Pie," but never suggests that religious feeling shall be denied its natural expression in gesture. Its ceremonial ordinances, indeed, are positive, not negative, aimed at safeguarding Christian worship against the irreverences of Puritanism, rather than at laying down a formal maximum which shall not be exceeded.

---

* *The Chronicle of Convocation*, vii., 1. S.P.C.K. 2s.

Two consequences follow from this vitality of the Church of England. One is seen in the present movement for the revision of the Prayer Book; the other in the need of providing for services of various kinds for occasional and particular use. But the course of the first is slow, and the occasions of the second changeable; so that what is wanted is a living authority able to guide and regulate the devotional life of the Church, not superseding but supplementing the authority of books. This authority is to be found in "the constitutional exercise of the *jus liturgicum* of the Bishop"; and it is because of the way in which this subject is handled that the Bishop of Southwark's addresses are of such far-reaching interest.

The particular subject on which the Bishop of Southwark was consulting his Synod was that of Reservation; and he takes occasion to deal at length with the plea sometimes made that Reservation is obligatory by canon law in every parish church. We are bound to say that the Bishop's contentions seem to us unanswerable. The appeal to canon law is an appeal which stultifies itself. If it is a consistent appeal, obviously we cannot simply choose which parts of it we will take, and which leave; we should have to revert to the whole *gamut* of mediæval practice—a policy which, in point of fact, not the most "Western" of Anglo-Catholics thinks of adopting. But still more damaging to this appeal is the restriction which canon law itself imposes upon its own authority through the operation of the principles of "desuetude" and "contrary custom." The position is succinctly put in a quotation which the Bishop of Southwark makes from Dr. Adrian Fortescue's article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics* (vii., 834). It is probably the case that mere non-user does not constitute desuetude. But when a contrary custom has grown up, and is in itself reasonable (as in the English service for the Communion of the Sick), and when it has the prescription of forty years' uninterrupted use with the consent of the superior, then no doubt can remain that the old canon must be regarded as having lapsed.*

Nor is the case merely a legal one. We publish to-day the first part of an article by the Rev. K. E. Kirk, dealing with certain cases of conscience from the standpoint of Moral Theology. The first case, that of Fasting Communion, is closely analogous to that of Reservation, in that it appears to be enjoined by English canons. *Mutatis mutandis*, all that Mr. Kirk says of the canonical

* I am much indebted throughout this paragraph to a Memorandum which has been kindly sent me on this subject by Canon Ackerley.

obligations in the one case applies also to the other. To some his conclusion that "whatever obligation the rule of fasting communion once had upon the conscience of Anglicans, it no longer has any such obligation as an ecclesiastical law" may seem over-strong meat. More important, however, is the question of whether or not it is true. If it is true—and we do not doubt that it is—then we shall all be the better for knowing it. We shall be saved from arguments that will not do, and be able to appraise the obligations of the Catholic custom without being fettered at the start.

We must not here digress into the question of Fasting Communion; it is, we believe, being carefully considered in responsible Anglo-Catholic circles. But how stands the matter with regard to Reservation, when we have laid the ghost of the canon law? It stands, we venture to say, on far stronger ground—on the unassailable ground of the Gospel. What necessitates Reservation is Christ's command given when He instituted the Sacrament, and the fact that in modern conditions this command cannot be observed without it. That, moreover, is the consideration which makes it impossible to admit that the consent of the individual Bishop is in all cases required for Reservation. There comes a point—and none emphasized this more than the Reformers—where a priest may have to say that he must obey God rather than men; and when it is a question of the secure administration of the Bread of Life, that point is reached. We do not believe that there is any fear of this final appeal having to be made in the present state of the Church of England. Bishops are happily in close touch with their clergy and people, and know the circumstances. But it is worth while to realize that it is the Gospel, and not the canon law, which is the ground of our contention.

When we pass from the principle of Reservation to the manner of reserving and other details, the case is different. We pass at once into the category of things governed by the XXXIVth Article, and which are to be decided by Anglican authority. In part this may be by rubrical direction; though, for our own part, we would rather have no new rubric on the subject than one that contained narrowing restrictions. But whether there be a new rubric or not, there are many matters of detail to be decided with which no rubric would be likely to deal. By an overwhelming majority the Southwark Synod gave their vote for the principle that "the place and mode of Reservation and all matters relating thereto should rest with the Bishop, who

shall act in accordance with such rules as shall be framed from time to time by the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province, or with Canons lawfully passed by the Convocations of the Province." No doubt these two methods of procedure are not intended to be mutually exclusive; whatever rules may be framed by the Bishops would receive added authority if they were embodied in canons of Convocation.

There remains the question of devotions in connection with the Sacrament reserved. Our own position was made plain in the May issue of this journal: we believe that the reserved Sacrament will be largely used as a focus for private devotion, but that there is, and will be, but little demand for "corporate devotions." But we should regret any step which should appear to foreclose devotional experiment. The true solution of such problems would seem to be, here as elsewhere, in the constitutional use of the *jus liturgicum* of the Bishop. It belongs to the Bishop's office to be in touch with the devotional needs of his clergy and people, and to guide and regulate their expression. A living authority of this kind can do more than any rubric to ensure that the Church's rule and proportion of prayer are not compromised by what is one-sided, sensational, or bizarre. And this is especially the case when a bishop consults his clergy in synod on matters of this kind; for then individuals feel the influence of the corporate mind of their brethren in the ministry, while the Bishop himself has clear and first-hand information as to the meaning and purpose of what he is asked to allow. A bishop's admonitions given upon such a basis come, therefore, with a peculiar force. They do not commit the Church as a whole to approval of any innovations put forward for sanction; but they enable these to be tested and tried without prejudice, and valuable experience can be gained. The question whether or not the result would be, tentatively and under careful restrictions, to allow corporate devotions in connection with the reserved Sacrament is of less importance than the fact that a procedure would have been adopted which was supple enough for the matter in hand, and gave due weight to every point of view among the brethren; while individual cases of disobedience, if such were found, could not be mistaken for examples of courage or zeal. On the other hand, a principle of Catholic order would have been asserted, resting upon clear apostolic teaching, and frequently cited by our Reformation divines; and its application would provide the surest guarantee that the whole proportion of faith to which the Church of England witnesses would not be endangered by undue emphasis on any one of its parts.

THE ORTHODOX CHURCHES—III.

THE next subject to which our attention will naturally be drawn can best be put in the form of a question, What is the relation of this group of Churches to the Anglican communion in general and to the Church of England in particular? And I confess it is an extremely difficult question to answer. I know, or I think I know, the attitude of a number of Orthodox leaders, but how far they are representative, how far their ideas and desires in regard to us are shared by the larger number of the clergy and laity of the different national Churches it is extremely hard to say. I doubt, too, if any generalization will be sound. The attitude of Roumanians, Serbs, Bulgars, and Greeks cannot all be described by any single adjective. A newcomer, finding himself greeted with delightful cordiality, might naturally infer that all was well, and write home with enthusiastic confidence on the subject of Reunion. That the door is open, open wide, and that there stand at it men of parts and character holding out the hand of welcome and friendship is certain; as it is also certain that the welcome and friendship are genuine. Of that we can feel sure. But it is the door of a very large and ancient Eastern palace containing no one knows how many souls, who do not all see exactly alike. There are different parties, with prejudices and policies that clash. Our wisdom and our dignity alike demand no lack, indeed, of cordial response to our kind and generous welcome, but a certain measure of restraint till more is known of the attitude of the inmates as a whole. What has brought about the open door and the cordial reception is plain enough; and what raises the doubts is hardly obscure.

What procures the welcome is the large measure of common ground which both Anglican and Orthodox find they occupy. They recognize, for instance, that, like them, we stand on a conviction that within the unity of the Church Catholic national Churches can exist, expressing the idiosyncrasies of national character and condition, without impairing the unity or creating a schism. It is on record how surprised and delighted Casaubon was when, on visiting England, he made this discovery. Something of the same kind has happened again. These autocephalous national Churches who cherish their autonomy only less than their loyalty to the Church Catholic recognize a kinship of spirit in us. And they do so with all the more clearness and vividness because with us, as with them, it means that we cannot accept Papalism or the Roman Catholic view of the nature of the Church. They recognize also that we not only

hold this view, but that in our practice we act on it consistently. One crucial test of our sincerity is that though we have been working in their midst for a long time now, having our churches and clergy in all parts of the Orthodox East, we not only refrain from all attempt to make proselytes, we do not even accept converts. They know that we shall not do anything willingly or intentionally to weaken them in their various countries; on the contrary, that we desire in any way we can to play a friend's part.

All this was clear before the war, but during and since it has become clearer. The courage and sympathy of Canterbury in regard to the Russian Church in her agony and to the Patriarch Tikon; the help given to the Serbian Church; and the support that meant so much in critical days to the Œcumenical Patriarchate, are only some of the ways by which our genuine friendship has manifested itself.

But there is more than this. In far more important matters —matters of creed and faith and practice—their better-informed and more discerning minds see and acknowledge a large measure of what I will call "family likeness." It needs some discernment to do this, for externally nothing could appear to have less resemblance. Considering the inexpressible differences, first in national character and then in the historical conditions under which the Near East and England have developed, it is of the nature of miracle that any real resemblance exists to be discerned. But "a man's a man for a' that," and men who hold in common the Christian faith can always discern a large measure of agreement if they will look below the surface. I had the privilege of celebrating the Blessed Sacrament after the manner of the English Church in S. Nicholas, a parish church of Sophia. I brought my altar, vested anglicanly, out from behind the iconostasis far down into the chancel, which was well filled with Bulgarian clergy of various ranks and positions. Anything less like their mode can hardly be imagined, and they were all seeing it for the very first time, and no word was understandable. Yet when it was over I had ample proof that every one of them had found in it the Sacrament they revered. The brevity and extreme simplicity of our use as compared with theirs did not repel any; while the more learned of them saw features in ours as primitive as anything in their own liturgies, and drawn plainly from a common source. I mention the incident not for itself, but as an illustration, and as expressing a principle which acts wherever a chance arises. And, further, many of their leaders are not unversed in English theology. In my experience not a few who will not try to speak our language can read it, and I see books bearing names well known

in England in their book-cases. And it is a fact recognized by such readers that the English Church has come through the great crisis of nineteenth-century discovery and intellectual revolution with the Faith unimpaired. They recognize that with us there has been no stifling of discussion, no "Index," and that the new facts about life and new principles of science have been frankly met. And they value this very highly, for they have yet got that crisis to face. With national education still at an early stage, and modern thought, modern ideas, problems and questions flooding in, not gradually as they came in England, but simultaneously and full grown; and with teachers whose minds and views will be—must be—formed chiefly by French and German authorities, there will come a crisis of the severest kind. There are a few prescient minds who are aware of this, and they desire to draw closer the uniting bonds with us.

Moreover, at the present moment the Orthodox Churches in many countries are being attacked, as they never have been before, by Protestant missionaries, chiefly from America. Seventh-Day Adventists, and Baptists who are also Seventh-Day folk, and other similar bodies, full of enthusiasm and well financed, are pushing their way into villages and remoter towns, and are threatening to disintegrate the unity of national religion. At the same time, Roman activities are not less than they were, and recent changes have given fresh opportunities for enlarging the influence of the Vatican. In pre-war days, when Roumania was inhabited almost entirely by Roumanians, and Serbia by Serbians, there was practically only one Church and one form of Christianity in the land. But the post-war extensions of these countries have brought in a very large number of Roman Catholics; and in both the problem of national religion has been enormously complicated thereby. A short time ago the Minister of Religion in Jugo-Slavia was a Roman Catholic priest, a fact which is almost a portent. Towns like Irig, not very far from Belgrade, in which 7,000 people dwell, fairly evenly divided between Orthodox, Lutheran, and Roman, present a disturbing feature in national life as compared with the simplicity of conditions before the war. All these threats and invasions have their influence, and do not make our friendship and support less desirable. We are all too familiar with such factors, and can speak with experience. The fact that we failed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to achieve anything like religious unity for England does not make us useless advisers; for we now see clearly some, at least, of our worst mistakes.

If this were all that had to be said, nothing could be better. But there is another side which must now be stated, not because

I believe it to be overwhelmingly important, but because it is as wise to recognize and value adverse factors as it is to discern the helpful ones.

And first of all we are dealing with national Churches whose best-known characteristic is their conservatism. Had they been less stiff, less convinced; had they even been a little more elastic or accommodating they would have ceased to exist. It was as much the instinct of preservation as anything else which made them so conservative. But it undoubtedly clashes with this spirit of extreme and inveterate conservatism to accept and regard as an equal and sister Church one which departs so far from their treasured uses and practices and beliefs as we do. Our churches without screens or ikons or pictures; our brief unsung services; our organists and pews and chairs; our clean-shaven clergy and married Bishops; the absence of monasteries; the feebleness of our consciousness of the Communion of Saints as they interpret and act upon it, are only a few, a very few, of the more salient contrasts between us. And then our theology is most perplexing. Apart from the *Filioque* Clause, our Thirty-nine Articles are disturbing to their theologians, and in some points repellent. Even more confusing, perhaps, is the attitude of the Protestant wing of our Church, and the freedom with which modernists are allowed to torpedo any part of the Creed and to dispose of the sacraments as magic introduced into Christianity from the "mystery religions" of Imperial Rome. To foreigners who do not know Hyde Park on Sunday afternoon, and that these things are English rather than Anglican, such phenomena are apt to bewilder; and I am rather disposed to wonder at the number of Orthodox to whom they can be made intelligible, than that they should antagonize a conservative Eastern mind.

Nor is this all which has to be reckoned with. The history of these nations has developed a very intense nationalism, in which love of one's own country comes distinctly second to mistrust and hatred of what is foreign. Recall the history of the Near East for many centuries, and you will see that this is inevitable. And so it cannot be surprising to find frequently, even among the best educated, a certain attitude which it would be an exaggeration to call xenophobia, but which hovers between a disdain and dislike of all that is foreign. And then we must not overlook the fact that there is a tendency to regard religious matters as always and necessarily political. Two or three years ago I went in the ordinary course of my "rounds" to a Balkan capital, and while there the same city was visited by one of those mysterious and rather sinister financial magnates whom the war threw up. This special one had received some very

marked British distinctions, and was regarded by many in Europe as a British agent. Immediately his visit and mine were connected, and an article in a widely read newspaper explained the connection. His object was, the paper asserted, to obtain for Great Britain important oil concessions in Asia Minor, access to which would be easier if this particular country were under British influence. My presence there was to support the scheme. The union between the English Church and this Orthodox one would result in King George V. being head of both! Through the national Church England would rule the nation, and so the Asiatic concessions would be secure. The article ended on a reassuring note. The life of a Church and of a union of Churches whose main object was not religion but oil wells would not be long; and so our effort need not be greatly feared. To an English mind all this suggests Mr. Gilbert supplying Sir A. Sullivan with words for sprightly tunes. Nor do I suggest that the article was taken seriously by all who read it. But it belonged to serious journalism. It would never have been printed unless there had been reason to believe that a large number of readers would accept it as stating a possible policy, and a plausible explanation of the sudden visit of two British agents simultaneously to the hub of that part of the universe. And I use it now as an instance, all the more striking because so very extreme, of the extent to which things religious and political are regarded as identical in these countries. The Orthodox Churches are not free to make departures until the possible and even improbable political consequences have been very narrowly examined, and it seems likely that political advantage will accrue.

Last, but I cannot say least, the absorption of the leaders of our own Anglo-Catholic movement in Rome, Roman doctrines, Roman practices, tends to warn off the Orthodox. A celebrated telegram to the Pope; the swift spread of Benediction or devotions to or towards the reserved Sacrament; the desire to have not only celibate religious Orders, but the secular clergy celibate too; the desire to substitute a Latin Mass for one in the tongue of the people, and the decidedly pro-Roman atmosphere of this most active and zealous section of the English Church, give the Eastern Churchman cause to hesitate. If now and then some sign were given that could be interpreted to mean that not only in Italian circles were things Catholic to be found; if, for instance, in the use to be made of the reserved Sacrament the way of Orthodoxy were regarded as worth considering, it would make a very great difference. Up to fifteen or twenty years ago the recovery in the Church of England, or the reassertion of the Catholic part of our tradition and heritage

was watched with joy and hope by the few Orthodox scholars who followed what was happening here. But of late and increasingly this growth has retarded rather than helped their approach, for to these outside observers it has seemed more and more Roman, and even Italian in tendency.

But there is no reason to believe that this second and adverse set of considerations have a weight equal to the first and promising set. If only we can use the great opportunity given us by the open door and the friendly welcome much can be achieved. In one thing we are specially blessed, in our venerable, but thank God vigorous, leader, the Archbishop of Canterbury. If he and those whom he has gathered round him, including our other Archbishop, can go on quietly and steadily, provided always that no new political upheaval occurs, the next few years may see an advance from a tentative friendship to a real understanding, which will not only be a true joy in very honourable and legitimate sentiment, but a fresh source of power and life in Christendom.

JOHN GIBRALTAR.

(To be concluded.)

IS GENESIS I. A MANIFESTO AGAINST NATURE WORSHIP?

MUCH of the discussion of Genesis i. has turned on its relation to science, but modern investigations into folklore raise another possibility. Some years ago Dr. Oesterley* showed that Ps. xci. had apparently been originally written as "a psalm against enchantments"—a kind of pre-Christian St. Patrick's Breastplate; is it possible that the first chapter of Genesis had a kindred origin? In other words, was it a manifesto against the worship of nature gods, and especially against the fertility cults which formed so marked a feature of Canaanite worship, and which had, up to the time of the Exile, such a fatal attraction for Israel? These cults the author combats not by argument, but by setting out the conception of the unity of the control of nature in the hands of a transcendent creator God, in a way that leaves no standing for any other power.

We have no details of the creation myths of Canaan, but of those of Babylon, with which this chapter is generally associated, we have fairly full details, which have points of correspondence with those of Egypt and Greece. The Babylonian creation originated with Tiamat and her monstrous brood in the "deep" of chaos; from this rose successive generations of

* *Psalms in the Jewish Church.*

gods, until one was reached who was able to attack the original chaos, whose evil nature was recognized, and bring it to order, establishing a heavenly company of gods, instead of the dark powers of earth or water.

But whatever might be the orthodox theology, there seems always to have remained a sense that the real creative life-force was not with the new bright gods of order, but with the dimmer, older earth powers* (somewhat as the medicines of our childhood are suspected of losing their efficacy when their nastiness has been " refined " away in consideration of the weaker palates of modern days), and special rites and mysteries were performed in connection with them with a view to securing fertility for earth and man and beast. The nature of the ceremonies might vary in different places, but in Syria in the worship of the Great Mother, and in Babylon, of Istar, they were openly immoral.

In the ancient world—and, indeed, in our own up to the time of the industrial revolution—the source of wealth lay more in the products of the land than in manufacture and commerce, and the limitations of transport made it essential that local crops should be adequate (Palestine might starve while there was corn in Egypt), and fertility cults, magical and otherwise, abounded as insurance against famine. These cults seem to have exercised an irresistible attraction upon Israel and Judah. Hosea ii. 5-8 shows them in operation in Israel, but the calves of Jeroboam I. set up after his residence in Egypt, where cow and bull were worshipped as emblems of fertility, may have been connected with the cult. The list of objects destroyed by Josiah shows the extent to which Manasseh had gone, but Micah i. 13 may imply that sun-worship was practised much earlier. In Ezekiel viii. are to be seen beast-worship, sun-worship, and wailing for Tammuz, the vegetation god, to mention no more instances. Nature gods were everywhere, and in Babylonia and Egypt, both great agricultural nations with vast systems of irrigation, they were probably at least as prominent.

But in the world of these cults there was no unity of control. Babylon or Egypt might have a hierarchy of Great Gods, each with his special department of control in nature. But unless by conquest, they had no authority outside their own land (see 2 Kings xvii. 24-41). In Canaan each little nation had its own limited tribal deity, by no means always in accord with his neighbours. But could even the greatest of these gods be

* See Miss Jane Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion* for a discussion of the comparative efficacy assigned to the worship of the Olympian and Athenian deities.

looked upon as dominating a world from which he himself had been evolved? Might there not be some other power behind, Fate, or the forces of the rulers of destiny, the heavenly bodies? There were the local baals, too, with their powers over crops, herds, flocks, streams, and wells, to be taken into account, and they were probably much more personal to the villager than the official god of his nation. There was no one authority to whom everything was related, and whose authority would run through all departments of life; no one power on whom to depend with certainty, but many whom it was not safe to neglect.

Against this nature worship and its accompaniments the prophets lift up their voices, and declare that the whole control of the natural world is in the hands of the Most High God, the transcendent Creator. This is the thesis of the author of Gen. i., and the way he treats it is theological, not scientific. He deals almost exclusively with the subject of nature and fertility, there is no mention of metals or precious stones, or such sources of wealth, nor of the Lord's authority over national life. All has to do with His lordship over natural processes.

The Chapter.

The First Condition of Control (Gen. i. 1-2).—God created the world. He was not evolved out of it. He is external to it, and so able wholly to dominate it. He starts with full control from the beginning. The author accepts the primæval chaos, but it is created, not creative, and from the beginning "the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Tiamat was never in charge, even of chaos. The source of creation is not evil. (This point is reinforced by the inclusion in chapter iii. of the story of the introduction of evil into a good world, in contradistinction to the stories of the evolution of good out of an evil one.)

Light (3-4).—There was no need, as in Egypt, for a long evolution before light could be created, or for a delay till the dark powers could be conquered. With the whole symbolism of darkness in mind the writer declared that things had their origin in light and goodness.

The Firmament (6-8).—Man in the ancient world was a good farmer, but the weather was beyond his control by normal means, and he had recourse to the forms of magic. Sir James Frazer shows the importance of the office of rain-maker in early communities, and that, in some cases, it was one of the royal functions.* The controller of the sky was the controller of the

* *Golden Bough.*

weather. The Hebrew author uses for firmament a wholly impersonal term, by which he may quite possibly mean "the outer moving crystal firmament," but certainly did not mean the goddess Nut, or the half of Tiamat "split like a haddock," and fastened with a bolt. The rain, the waters above and below the firmament were in the hands of the Creator. There was no scope for weather magic.

Sea, Land, and Vegetation (9-13).—Sir James Frazer points out how many of the greater gods of the near East were connected with vegetation, Attis, Osiris, Adonis, Tammuz, whose mysteries needed to be celebrated to ensure good crops. But, says Genesis i., the herb yielding seed and the fruit tree yielding fruit with the power of reproduction, does it, not by ritual or magical aid or compulsion, but from the beginning by the command of the God who made it. Fertility cults are unnecessary, and the God who commands the growth commands on the one side the rain and on the other the sun.

The Heavenly Bodies (14-19).—"And God made two great light-bearers." The sun and moon were not self-radiant high gods, as Ra, Horus, or Khemsu, or Samas and Sin, but obedient light-bearers working to a prescribed time-table. They were not of the original lords, but made later on when wanted. Why apply to them for power? (Saint Ives points out that much of the ceremonial of sun-worship at the solstices and equinoxes was really a fertility cult, intended to secure the effect of the sun's power for the earth.*)

The stars, to "the nations" the arbiters of destiny, are dismissed in one word, "and-the-stars." The Hebrew prophets seem to have had a special animus against the stars, under fear of which the ancient world lived, and we meet with repeated assertions of their subordinate position, culminating in the vision of Rev. i. 16, where the Lord, Who is later seen as arbiter of history (v., vi.), is seen with the "seven stars" held in His hand. It is a repudiation of astrology from Babylon (Isa. xlvii. 13) to Old Moore.

The Waters, and Life in Sea and Air (20-23).—Here are possibly two lines of thought.

1. The water powers were regarded as creative and productive forces. Osiris—in one aspect the Nile—Hapi, and Hekt were creative water powers. In Babylon it was from Tiamat in the deep that creation began, and Nina (another form of Istar) was "a goddess of creation typified in the teeming life of ocean."† But in Genesis the waters bring forth by command of the Creator as did the land, and the creatures in air and water

* *Essais de Folklore Biblique.*
† Pinches, *Religions of Babylonia and Assyria.*

increase and multiply by His ordinance. There is no place for creative water powers.

2. Dr. Oesterley has shown the widespread persistence of the idea of " the deep " as the home of monsters, generally of an evil tendency, from Apep and Rahab in Egypt, Tiamat and Kingu in Babylon, to the Midgard Serpent and Grendel,* and has shown that there was probably an old Hebrew myth of a combat between the Lord and some " dragon " (Pss. lxxiv. 13-14, lxxxix. 9-10; Isa. xxvii. 1, li. 9-10). But here the creation of the sea monsters is put late in the series. They are deprived of their ancient primæval pride of place, and made created and subject, not even rebellious, much less creative. Every " day " deprives a group of *elilim* of authority to vest it in the hands of Elohim.

Man and Beast (24-31).—Egypt was the home of beast gods, and cow and bull were worshipped there as symbols of fertility. Ezekiel saw beast-worship in his vision of the Temple, a vision probably based on what he knew was going on there. Here the animal creation is definitely put under the dominion of man; he is not to worship, but to rule them. Man needs fertility cults as little as does vegetation, for to him also is given at his creation the command to increase and multiply. In fact, all that is aimed at in the fertility cults and nature worship is given to man as a gift. He has no need for magic and ritual to secure it.

It is possible that some of our folklore experts put too much stress on fertility cults, but even then the relation of this chapter to the worship of nature gods holds good, and this psalm of creation brings all departments of the production of life under the control of the one Lord. It sums up the teaching of both law and prophets, and lays down the presuppositions underlying the teaching of both. By this faith man might be delivered from the fears of an uncertain world with no central authority, into one where ran the law of one God who had made all things to be good. Unity of control in trustworthy hands made fearless obedience possible and rational. It is one of the visions of splendid faith to realize that there were members of a small subject nation who could stand before Karnak in all its glory, or before one of the mighty ziggurats of Babylonia and say, " Nevertheless, in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth. . . ."

M. D. R. Willink.

* *Evolution of the Messianic Idea.*

THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC PILGRIMAGE

A JOURNEY of a month, with the object of visiting as pilgrims the Holy Places, the scenes of our Lord's life on earth and of the journeys of His Apostles, hurried though it must have seemed to many of us, must have left some impressions which should be worth recording, fragmentary though they may be. To set them down may serve to strengthen their effect on ourselves and perhaps to encourage others to do as we have done.

And let not anyone who reads this think that there was anything heroic in our journey or unusual in the persons who undertook it. We had probably no greater inconveniences at any time than those which beset Chaucer's pilgrimage to Canterbury; and for ourselves I think we were not at all unlike his famous pilgrims. We were of all sorts and conditions of men and women, yet I think there were none of us who had not a higher sense of the privilege of being pilgrims than many of those "that toward Caunterbury wolden ryde." But I think we should all say, as they all no doubt said, what a letter from a fellow-pilgrim which reached me just as I had written the above words says, "What a time we had, both sacred and profane!" I do not think any who went can have failed to feel their interest aroused and kept up without flagging to the end. I am quite sure that very many felt much more than this: have felt, indeed, that it was a true inspiration of God, that we were led by Him on our journey and furthered by His continual help.

I

The afternoon before we started we received the blessing of the Bishop of Willesden, deputed by the Bishop of London, and he spoke to us most wisely, urging the reality of the pilgrimage as a spiritual adventure, not a journey of pleasure. The metropolitan Germanos, representing the Greek Orthodox Church, also addressed us, and blessed us. His words were worth treasuring, and especially these: "Setting foot on the Holy Land, I am sure you will remember all the struggles which the Orthodox Brotherhood of the Holy Sepulchre endured in the days of oppression and persecution for the preservation of the shrines to the Christian worship, and that your wish to support the Brotherhood will be confirmed. I am sure also that another sentiment will arise from this pilgrimage—that is, the desire that the reunion of the Churches may be fulfilled as soon as possible, that quarrels between Christians may cease, and so,

united in faith and heart, all assembled in the Holy Places may praise the most honoured and glorious name of our Lord Jesus Christ."

In that spirit we left London. At first I think I had better tell briefly where we went and what we did, for I am not writing for those who went on pilgrimage in 1925, or 1924, still less for those who are like the Wife of Bath—"And thrië's hadde she been at Jerusàlem"—but for those who would know how men fare on a pilgrimage nowadays and how themselves, perhaps, may go also; for, indeed, these Anglo-Catholic pilgrimages are like to continue and to bring English Christians to know the Holy Land as so many of their forefathers as pilgrims or crusaders knew it of old.

The Holy Land was, of course, our main objective; but it was a happy thought which made the Committee extend the tour into a pilgrimage which should also visit sites associated with St. Paul and St. John, and then not restrict us even so far. Thus we first landed at Alexandria, once, as Strabo says, μέγιστον ἐμπόριον της οἰκουμένης, and still an important port and a busy city, where the mole and Pompey's pillar bring one in close contact with the past; indeed, much of what Strabo says of the harbour and the town is appropriate still. Our business was with the Church: our own, where Dr. Douglas preached; and then to the Patriarch, who, with the Archbishop of the Jordan, well known in England, received us with remarkable cordiality. At all our ecclesiastical visits formal addresses were presented, which were drawn up, I think, by Dr. J. A. Douglas (Vicar of St. Luke's, Camberwell, and Canon of Southwark) most admirably, and in each case translated by him into the language of the prelate who was addressed. These, of course, followed much the same lines, with fitting local adaptations. I will give the first here that it may serve as a specimen:

"We, Henry Russell, lately Bishop of Birmingham, together with the fifty-five priests and one hundred and sixty faithful laity of the Anglican Church now passing eagerly on our way in Pilgrimage to the Holy City, desire to assure your Holiness of the sincere goodwill which we bear alike to the Church of Egypt and to the whole Orthodox Church. Indeed, the purpose of our Pilgrimage is to seek the Healing and Refreshment of our souls by the Grace of the Incarnate Son of God in that land wherein He accomplished the Salvation of the World. But we rejoice to pause on our journey thither at the famous City where the Blessed Evangelist St. Mark planted and ruled the Church, and whence the Great Athanasios proceeded to Nicæa, sixteen centuries ago in this year, to contend for the Holy Faith once and for all committed to the Saints.

"As in the days of the Isapostolic Emperor Constantine, the arch-enemy of our one Holy Faith, who is the Father of Lies, suborned the heresiarch Areios, so as through the ages, now in these later days he still

puffs up the proud hearts of men with knowledge, falsely so called, to make shipwreck of the Truth. As also the Christ has ever raised up wise and holy men such as the Blessed Athanasios, who though alone against the World, so stood fast for the Faith, now we pray that the intercessions of the Great Confessor may prevail that He will deliver and preserve alike the Holy Orthodox Church and our Nation from every kind of false teaching. And to that end, as for the fulfilment of the purpose of our Pilgrimage, and for our safe return, we ask the prayers of your Holiness and of the Orthodox Flock of Egypt."

The reply of Photios, Patriarch and Œcumenical Pope, was equally careful and equally cordial. He was careful to use the word " brotherly " of our relations—Anglicans and Orthodox—to each other; and this recognition, in different words but with precisely the same *motif*, was, I think, given to us by every prelate whom we visited during the whole of our pilgrimage. The Patriarch here spoke especially of our unity in the faith of St. Athanasius. After this visit we attended the Liturgy in the Armenian Cathedral, where the Rev. Harold Buxton, one of our party, had already preached when we arrived. Here our Bishop, who was wearing the robes of an Oxford D.D. (conferred on him by the Archbishop of Canterbury), was taken to the sacristy and emerged in an Armenian cope and huge mitre, of the seventeenth-century type, and then spoke to the congregation and blessed them, his words being translated when he had finished. The Armenian altar is, of course, open to the church, not behind an eikonostasis, and the whole decoration shows strong signs of Roman influence; but between the Orthodox and the Armenians there is very little real divergence. In the afternoon we visited the Coptic patriarchal vicar and his church, which is as simple as the Armenian is elaborate. Himself a man on whose face simplicity and holiness are stamped most unmistakably, he received us with a paternal affection which was deeply touching. In his church the relics are the arm and head of St. Mark, which we all venerated: they have a very ancient history; and it was fitting that the Coptic address to us should make special reference to the unchanged antiquity of the faith which this church preserves.

Canon Douglas had supplied us all with an admirable paper on the history and theology of the Eastern Churches; and we found that those between which no formal intercommunion exists, and where, indeed, in the past, charges of heresy and schism have been bandied about with more or less accuracy, are now almost entirely friendly to each other. The difference between them, indeed, here and almost all over the East, is racial not theological. Union might very possibly take place to-morrow were it not for political difficulties. " Cujus regio

ejus religio"; and *regio* here is not so much geographical as national and constitutional. The rights of an Orthodox Greek are different from those of an Armenian or a Copt, and grave difficulties would beset the individual who passed from one communion to another or the Church which endeavoured to unite those of different race. The problem of Eastern Reunion is seen at its plainest in Egypt; and yet the decay of theological differences, the practical acceptance of the Nicene Creed, and the equal cordiality shown by all to the English Church, certainly point to something like a federal if not an actual union.

Then to Jaffa, where we passed by the traditional site of St. Peter's vision, and were received by the Archimandrite of the Orthodox Church, and said our first prayers and received our first blessing in the Holy Land. So began that wonderful journey to the Holy City itself, through agricultural lands into rocky gorges, from the plain of Sharon to the mountains of Judæa. We pass through Philistia, past sites that belong to the history of Samson, for the most part little changed for very many centuries save by the good roads which our troops have left as their memorial of the Great War.

At Jerusalem we walked to the hill near the station and the German hospital, singing the gradual psalms, and standing in the hot sun for our first view of the Holy City and across to the Mount of Olives. No one who sees this, and even more certainly no one who looks down upon the city, across the Kedron to the Walls, from the Chapel of the Ascension or the hill of Olivet, can ever feel (as I have heard some say) that Jerusalem disappoints the pilgrim. It is extraordinarily beautiful; it is so compact that the eye can take in its topographical significance at once and pass on in a few moments to identify the outstanding sites of sacred history. Dusty outside, dirty within, perhaps; yet grey walls, bright domes, dark trees, bright sunlight, make Jerusalem, which is the most sacred, not far from being the most beautiful city of the world. And, indeed, the scenery of the Holy Land, quite apart from its sacred associations, has an extraordinary charm. When we looked down from the Chapel of the Ascension at the summit of the Mount of Olives we saw a view of remarkable beauty: below the slope, dotted with trees and buildings, among which even the glaring Franciscan church may be forgiven, across the deep ravine where in winter flows the Kedron, up to the walls, mediæval and romantic, embodying no doubt some part of the walls of Herod, and beyond to the buildings—the mosque on Mount Moriah (so they say), which is the most conspicuous of them: at sunset a glowing and glorious prospect. A week before I had seen that magnificent picture by David Roberts at Holloway College in which all

the romantic beauty of the scene seems concentrated; and the reality was equal to the great artist's presentation of it.

Of the archæological interest of Jerusalem I hope to say a little, from the point of view of an ignoramus, later; meanwhile I will continue my brief narrative. We had been prepared by an extremely good address given to us by the Rev. Philip Usher, the English bishop's chaplain. Our first visit, of course, was to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It was a ceremonial one, all the clergy wearing gowns, and Bishop Wakefield leading us and saying a few words, very touching and deeply felt by us all, when we came to the Tomb itself. We were received by the Archimandrite Kyriakos (whose office is, I suppose, akin to that of a Dean in charge of a cathedral), and the bells, which hang on the great tower, built between 1160 and 1180, in the brightest days of the Christian kingdom, clanged tumultuously to greet us. (We are always told that the church was guarded by Muhammadan soldiers to keep the Christian pilgrims from flying at each other's throats. That is, of course, quite untrue now, and the only soldiers I saw were English—and sailors, too—paying most reverent visits to the Holy Places.) We enter over the slab which bears the name of the English Crusader, Philip Daubeney, 1236. Briefly, the sacred features of the wonderful congeries of chapels which form the Cathedral Church of the Holy Sepulchre are: the Stone of Anointing—immediately inside the entrance—where everyone kneels down and prays; then the tiny chapel of the Holy Sepulchre itself, entered through a little narthex, formed by low stones with benches and high candlesticks, and through the chapel of the Angels. At the Tomb itself again we venerated and prayed: is it not the most sacred spot in Christendom? Round this central object radiate, in the great rotunda, chapels of every Eastern rite, and from it we approach the chapels which bear the names of almost every incident in our Lord's passion. There, perhaps archæologically the most interesting of all because that whose continuity is unbroken, is the chapel of St. Helena, which no doubt is on the site of the Invention of the Cross by the Empress, which name is given to the chapel, a cavern in the rock below it. Here are altars of the Armenians and the Latins. I heard the end of a Latin mass there two mornings after, when I had finished my own in the chapel of Abraham. All about here are traces of the splendid work of the great age of Justinian. There are no finer capitals even in St. Sophia, or the Underground Cistern, or St. Sergius and St. Bacchus, than those here, also of the sixth century. Up a flight of steps, dark, as almost everywhere in the great church, are the chapels on Golgotha, notably the chapel of Calvary with

the altar of the Crucifixion—there in the wall is the rent rock—where again our President prayed aloud for the reunion of Christendom. Omitting many other beautiful and notable places, let me end by mentioning the chapel of Abraham which is in the Russian monastery attached to the great church, but entered separately from the courtyard. There is the altar reserved for the English Church by the Patriarch. There on May 6, at 7.30, I said our English mass, after visiting again the Holy Sepulchre, and joining in the masses of my brethren at earlier hours. Our chapel has good modern wall paintings and is very beautifully kept by the Russian nuns, who are, I fear, in the direst poverty.

That day, our first, ended by ascending the Mount of Olives, and visiting the chapel of the Ascension, at the centre of a large courtyard, the building itself showing fragments of antiquity, though, of course, the identification of the site is doubtful; it is, however, not far from Bethany. The view from outside the buildings of the Russian patriarchate is glorious. Then below, on the way towards the Garden of Gethsemane, is the chapel of the Lord's Prayer, where our Lord is said to have taught His Apostles. All about here are ancient columns, but the chapels are modern and of little interest. Then the descent begins, and we come to Gethsemane, where still are some remains of a garden with very ancient olive trees, but a large and rather ugly Franciscan basilica has encroached too much on the scenes and the memories of our Lord's night of agony; there is a stone there, in the church, which is called the Stone of the Agony. Then a very interesting and ancient church, the Tomb of the B.V.M., of which only the porch is above ground. In its present form the church dates from the time of Millicent, daughter of Baldwin II., who brought the crown of Jerusalem to her husband, Fulk of Anjou. The church is said to date from 1161, about the end of her life, but there are undoubtedly much earlier remains in it; and at any rate for more than seven hundred and fifty years it has been very little touched. That day, the fullest of sacred memory one can imagine concentrated in small space, ended by a dinner to which the chiefs of the different religious bodies were invited, as they had been earlier in the day to a garden party at which Bishop and Mrs. McInnes received us. This was the only time I was able to visit the cathedral of St. George, which is dignified and impressive, with the north choir aisle as a really beautiful chapel of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. Outwardly, from its commanding position, the most magnificent thing in Jerusalem is the Dome of the Rock. The great mosque of al-Haram-al-Sharif dates from the seventh, ninth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries. Beautiful though it is,

it is utterly unoriginal. It shows, as does nearly every other work of Muhammadan art, how entirely the new religion was indebted to the genius of the Christians. The rock is revered as the place where Abraham was ready to sacrifice Isaac; the area was believed by the Crusaders to be the site of the Temple, an opinion which is utterly discredited to-day. But I must confine myself to the Christian past: the Jewish relics were not the objects of our veneration.

Almost all my time in the Holy City was devoted to the church of the Holy Sepulchre, but I saw also the rich and beautiful Armenian cathedral and the pool of Hezekiah, a fine and typical ancient store of water. Our formal visit to the patriarch Damianos was made specially cordial by his kindness and the eagerness of Canon Douglas—the invariable leader and patron in our interviews with the Eastern prelates.

One afternoon I went to the Dead Sea, and it had none of the gloom the books are fond of describing. The sun shone brightly on the deep blue water, and tinged the mountains beyond. But it is a veritable pit of salt, a continuous descent from Jerusalem, and from Jericho too, where, ruined and practically obliterated though the city is, one can still see walls and gates which were doubtless seen by our Lord and His Apostles. And then that beautiful little river, the Jordan, small in the late spring, with here and there a pool overhung by trees, as at the traditional site of our Lord's Baptism, a quiet, lovely, secluded spot, with just one small house—a Christian's—beside it, where there is a ferry. Its peacefulness and the entire untouched simplicity of the river make it a place never to be forgotten: not crowded, save at the one festival, like the other holy places, but (one may fancy) just as it was when our Saviour went down into the water. Bethlehem has a certain similarity; it is quite plainly, in spite of the thousands of pilgrims who visit it, a little town where country life has gone on uninterrupted for centuries. It has its great church, projected by Helena, built by Constantine, restored by Justinian—a magnificent basilica with the chapel of the Nativity covering the rock-stable in which our Lord was born. The evidence for this is as conclusive as any cumulative evidence of centuries can be. I must be content to refer to the splendid book published by the Byzantine Research Fund. At Bethlehem certainly is an unbroken tradition, with historical statements to support it.

Now for a glorious and more adventurous way: to the Sea of Galilee, past Bethel and Azotus, and Gilgal and Gibeah and the well of Sychar, between Ebal and Gerizim, a land now fertile, now stony, of lovely distances, and onwards passing the almost deserted Samaria (Sebastieh), near which I picked some of the

spring flowers which a few weeks before must have carpeted all the roadsides; up the high mountain—so it seems when you rise by a winding and precipitous road from the plain below—on which stands the bright, rich, almost modern town of Nazareth. The Latin church over the ancient chapel of the Annunciation, supposed to be on the site of the home of the Blessed Virgin, was full for an exposition of Holy Scripture when I visited it; but we were allowed to see the Altar of the Annunciation, the remains of the ancient house, the slab which bears the inscription, "Verbum caro hic factum est." Of more certain authenticity is the village well, at the only place where a well could be, where one cannot doubt that the Holy Maiden drew water. Then a descent, at times as precipitous as the rise, through Cana, a prosperous village, at nightfall, passing the traditional Mount of the Beatitudes—seen long before this on our way—and so down at last to the level of the lake, exquisitely beautiful in the moonlight, and the crusaders' walls of Tiberias. Here we spent a close, hot night, and I looked out after midnight and in early dawn on the blue waters. Then very early to Capernaum (if such it be), where French archæologists have unearthed much very fine work, among them, no doubt, the remains of the Centurion's synagogue.

Then after leaving the waters of Merom to our left we turn eastwards, cross the Jordan at the point where the land mandated to the French touches our own, go eastwards, almost under the shadow of the glorious Hermon, still touched with snow, look northward to the heights of anti-Lebanon, and gradually sink into the fertile plain watered by the Pharpar, where lies the exquisite city of Damascus. The fertility after miles of arid sand is delicious; dusty though the streets are, there are trees almost everywhere, and you may almost feel yourself, as you mount to the roof of the house of Ananias or of Naaman the Syrian, or encircle the walls, mediæval, with Roman foundations at least, in the very time when Paul of Tarsus saw the vision of the Lord. They show you a superb view of the city from a hill, and tell you that it was here that the vision came; but it is in the wrong direction. Damascus is a fiercely Muhammadan city—even St. John Baptist, whose head is claimed to be preserved in the great mosque, is counted a Moslem saint—as events a very few days before I was there showed; but it is still the home of the Orthodox Patriarch of Antioch, whose welcome of us was extraordinarily cordial, and in whose cathedral our own mass was sung with many Arabian Christians, including the Patriarch himself, reverently watching us. In a remarkable way an English Christian feels himself at home among the Orthodox of Damascus; and yet since the seventh century it has never

been a Christian city. There for a while our pilgrimage ceases; we pass up the beautiful rugged valley of the Barada, and then on to visit the indescribably grand ruins of Baalbek, and know that there in the town which surrounds them is still a little Christian town. Again we turn westwards, mount by the astounding zigzag road up the anti-Lebanon and, through a succession of most magnificent views, descend the seventy miles which take us over Lebanon to Beirut. There our own Church welcomes us, and also we go to the mass—high mass they call it, but there is only a man or two to sing—of the Maronites; and so again to sea.

The later stages of our journey bring in memories of St. John and St. Paul. Cyprus, where the welcome at Larnaka and at Nikosia was really astounding, has the tomb (so it is said) of St. Barnabas, which we visited and venerated. Patmos, where the welcome was enthusiastic, shows the two monasteries, one with the " cave of the Apocalypse " in it, a rocky sanctuary like many in Palestine, the upper, at the summit of the island, with a magnificent library, where we saw all the famous MSS.—the earlier of the fourth century, perhaps—given by Alexius Comnenus, a cap and a chalice too that he gave to the house he founded. Smyrna I could not bear to land at, where the quay is still a scene of destruction. Ephesus, ruins I did not visit, in fields of rank grass. Constantinople where, happily, the little Christian village of Balukli still remains unharmed without the walls. Malta, where we worshipped in our own church, and saw the spit of land on which St. Paul was wrecked; here alone there was from the Christian Church which is " established " there no welcome. Rome is still aloof; yet round the church of the Hospitallers, where are still magnificent monuments of their Grand Masters, one can wander, and feel, for the lessons of the last weeks have entered into our souls, that we are the heirs of the same faith and baptism, the same God and Father of all. Our last day is spent at Naples. Of the lessons which now we garner in our hearts I must speak later on.

W. H. Hutton.

(To be concluded.)

FOUR CASES OF CONSCIENCE

In a recent book* I attempted to draw out those principles of moral theology which appear to affect the question of conformity to the teaching and practice of the Church in its relation to the dictates of conscience. I now venture to put forward a

* *Ignorance, Faith, and Conformity* (Longmans, 1925).

consideration, based upon the same principles, of four typical problems of the kind. For the benefit of those who have not read the book in question, summary references to the original authorities are added wherever propositions which might at first sight appear disputable have been cited without discussion. It need scarcely be added that these "solutions" are put forward tentatively only, with a view to eliciting the fullest possible criticism and discussion.

The general tenor of the cases is the same—an apparent conflict between the "certain" conscience of an individual Christian and a principle, more or less established, of Christian practice. The variety in the cases lies in the character of the principle involved in each, and the degree of obligation which it may be supposed to have *per se* upon the consciences of loyal Churchmen. The problems, however, do not deal with the primary duty of the penitent—that, it is clear, is to follow the lead of his conscience; which (as being "certain") is of absolute obligation.* They deal rather with what may be called his "secondary" duty:—Is he fulfilling the demands of Christian loyalty by remaining in communion with the Church, whilst holding (even though only in secret) views which it is conceivable that the Church would reprobate? Since, however, it is a reasonable opinion that considerations of Church loyalty alone never *demand* of an individual that he should sever himself from the community, however widely he may diverge from its principles, either in theory or practice, but that the onus of severance rests with the latter,† the problems are stated rather as problems of a confessor's conscience. If it is revealed to him in confession that his penitent seriously and conscientiously proposes to follow a course of which it cannot absolutely be said that the Church would approve, what is he to do? Is he to absolve or not to absolve? Those to whom the theory and practice of the confessional is of little importance or interest may still recognize that the problem in its other form—that of the demands of loyalty—is equally pressing, and is not wholly solved by the answer that the penitent *need not* sever himself from the community before the community has taken action. This "*need not*" is, after all, only valid on the hypothesis that conscience also sees no need for such severance; where conscience is doubtful on the point, the license offered by the phrase in question may prove, on a stricter determination, to be illusory.

* Aquinas, *S.T.*, i., 2, q. 19, a. 5; *Corp. Jur. Can.*, cc. 91-94, 97-99, 101, C. XI., q. 3; and especially the dictum of Innocent III., c. 44, X., v., 39.

† So *Corp. Jur. Can.*, c. 5, C. XV., q. 8; c. 10, X., iii., 2; *cf.* Aquinas, *S.T.*, iii., q. 64, a. 6, ad 2; Alph. Lig., *Theol. Mor.*, vii., 67; Taylor, *Duct. Dub.*, iii., 2, rule 2. An exception, *in foro interno* only, is recognized in the rare case of *ipso facto* excommunications.

A few preliminary observations are necessary.

(*a*) In all four cases it is assumed that the penitent is a mature and spiritually minded Christian, actively loyal to the Church of England, and genuinely conscientious in the matter under consideration. By this last is meant that he has adopted his position after the fullest consideration and reflection,* that he has no scruples whatever as to its rightness for him, that he cannot conceive himself as conscientiously free to adopt the contrary position; and that if (in consequence) it should appear that his position is condemned by the Church, he would be sincerely grieved at the divergence, but would still be unable in conscience to conform. It is only on these conditions that the cases under consideration assume the form of problems of *duty ;* and it is only in this form (as distinct from that of mere *legitimacy*) that agreement as to the importance of discussing them can at present be secured. Where a Christian says, " I conceive myself free to follow such and such a course of action," many will answer, " You have no right to conceive yourself free to follow any course except that of strict duty; there are no ' lawful ' or ' allowable ' actions except the actions which are duties." It is arguable, and indeed probable, that such an answer adopts a standpoint more rigorous than is demanded by, or compatible with, practical Christianity; it may even be said with a large degree of reasonableness that to insist on a determination of exact duty, as distinct from mere legitimacy, in every case of conscience, is to set before the practical director of souls problems incapable of solution. That, however, is beside the point at the moment. Our purpose is secured if we attribute to our hypothetical Christian a state of mind which all will agree to recognize as laudable in itself, by giving him a conviction of duty. Similarly, we shall put the problem in a form which all will recognize as valid if we ask, " What is the confessor's duty—to absolve, or not to absolve ?" rather than (in the more usual form), " May the confessor absolve or not ?"

(*b*) It might conceivably be urged that this hypothesis of the penitent's *bona fides*, which obviously relieves him of all responsibility for confessing the actions in question,† is equally

* If by any chance he were completely unconscious of any arguments whatever against his position, it would certainly be the duty of the confessor to enlighten him if the matter were at all serious; and if it were one affecting salvation, this would be the confessor's duty *even if he thought the penitent's point of view the more probable one*. The principles on which these conclusions are based will appear in the course of the discussion. The only case in which it is sometimes thought allowable for a confessor *not* to enlighten a penitent in " invincible ignorance " of this kind, is when it is foreseen that knowledge will not alter his course of action; and a confessor may only avail himself of this permission in matters of secondary importance. See Alph. Lig., *op. cit.*, vi., 610; Taylor, *Duct. Dub.*, i., 3, rule 8.

† For only *certain* mortal sin (*i.e.*, sin committed with the full consciousness of its sinfulness) *need* be confessed. It is assumed, therefore, in the text, that the problems come to the confessor's notice through the penitent's voluntarily asking his opinion or advice.

effective in relieving the confessor of responsibility. If the penitent is genuinely conscientious he ought to be absolved. This, however, can scarcely be admitted.* From the merely social point of view alone the rationale of penance would appear to be this: by mortal sin (than which there is certainly no other *necessary* "material" to bring a Christian to sacramental confession)† the offender has put himself outside the pale of the Church; in confession he asks to be received back. It would obviously be wrong to receive him back upon terms easier than those on which a catechumen would be received for the first time into the Church by baptism. Thus, to take an example from the mission field, if a catechumen who, on the most conscientious grounds imaginable, refused to abandon polygamy were resolutely refused baptism, it would be absurd to absolve him after baptism if, even though on equally conscientious grounds, he relapsed into and insisted on persevering in polygamy. And this gives us a useful rough-and-ready test to apply to such problems. The confessor can ask himself, "If this penitent presented himself for baptism, with the same definite intention of persevering in the practices which I deprecate, as he shows at present, should I conceive it to be my duty to baptize him?" If the answer to this question were found to be "No," it would carry with it, *a fortiori*, a negative answer in the case of sacramental absolution. If, on the other hand, the answer in the problem of baptism is "Yes," it does not necessarily carry an affirmative corollary in the second case; for the demands made by the Church upon a mature Christian may naturally enough be thought of as more serious than her demands from a neophyte.

(*c*) It is important to remember, however, that the refusal of absolution does not involve any *necessary* implication of the penitent's moral guilt;‡ and where absolution has to be refused this fact should clearly be pointed out. There will be tragic cases in the imperfect condition of the Church here upon earth, in which the conflict between a clear conscience and a clear "law" appears incapable of resolution; and the mark of such cases may well be the refusal of absolution to one who, in the fulness of spiritual maturity, can see nothing but a duty where the Church can only see a sin. In such cases it may be some relief to know that the Church, giving her limited verdict by the

* Thus, in the Roman communion, absolution can only be given if a penitent is *rite dispositus;* and this involves that, besides showing conscientiousness (*signa doloris*), he should be willing to discharge his positive and objective obligations (Rit. Rom. ap. Tanquerey, *Theol. Mor.*, i., 293; Gury-Ferreres, *Compend.*, ii., § 626).

† Aquinas, *S.T. Suppl.*, q. 6, aa. 1, 2; and commonly.

‡ For the Church's discipline may be unjust; *Corp. Jur. Can.*, cc. 27, 44-65, 77-90, C. XI., q. 3, and especially the letter of Innocent III., c. 28, X., v., 39.

lips of an imperfect human agent, submits that verdict wholly to the omniscient tribunal of God, and looks forward confidently to a day when the consciences both of Church and penitent, here found irreconcilable, shall be vindicated in a reconciliation higher than any human mind can conceive.

(*d*) By the "loyalty to the Church," which we attributed a moment ago to the penitent, was meant that he would recognize in duly promulgated regulations of his canonical superiors, as well as in such customs of his communion as were at once practically universal, and in themselves reasonable and good, an authority over conduct which claimed not merely consideration, but also (unless conscience clearly determined against it) ready obedience.* We thus confine ourselves, as was indicated in the first paragraph, to problems in which the clash is definitely between conscience and the demands (actual or possible) of loyalty. There are many other types of problem presented to the anxious conscience; but not a little is gained by grouping together instances of one type and considering them by the method of comparison and differentiation.

(*e*) It must be assumed, further, that these problems are envisaged in the atmosphere of the present discipline of the Church of England. It would no doubt make matters far easier for the individual confessor if competent authority would tell him in what cases he might not absolve; and, further, would reserve to its own jurisdiction such types of case as it conceived to be most serious. This, however, is not our present custom; and until it is altered (if it ever is, and no opinion is here expressed as to the desirability or otherwise of alteration) cases of the kind contemplated will continue to arise every day.

(*f*) It must be noted, finally, that universal assent is commanded by the proposition that a confessor may not, in any circumstances whatever, refuse communion to a penitent to whom he has refused absolution, on the mere ground that he has not been absolved; nor yet on the ground of any knowledge as to the offender's spiritual state which has come to him only through the confessional. To do otherwise would be a gross violation of the seal of the confessional. Alphonso Liguori takes up an eminently sound position when he adds to this the statement that even if the penitent asks for communion privately, it must be given, otherwise the seal is violated.†

1. Fasting Communion.—It may be assumed that the practice of fasting communion was at one time established and enforced as an ecclesiastical disciplinary rule in the Church of

* *Cf. Articles of* 1552, XX. and XXXIV. (§ 2).

† Alph. Lig., *Theol. Mor.*, vi., § 658, and all moderns; against Aquinas and some ancient authorities. *Cf. ibid.*, vi., §§ 50, 51, 246.

England. It is clear that it is no longer either established or enforced, though it has come into not infrequent use again as a pious custom. The confessor who holds that the "contrary" custom which abrogated the law, and so left the decision of this matter to the individual conscience, was a "reasonable" one—*i.e.*, to the honour of God, the welfare of the Church, and the benefit of the individual soul—will obviously have no difficulty in absolving a penitent who, in good faith, does not find himself called by conscience to fast before communion; for "reasonable" custom, if "prescribed," can always abrogate ecclesiastical law.* Another confessor, however, might deprecate the neglect of fasting communion so much that he could not regard it as other than "unreasonable." Two questions would then present themselves to him: (i) "As this disciplinary law has never been revoked by canonical authority in the Church of England,† and has certainly not been abrogated by reasonable custom, must I not regard it as still binding upon conscience?" (ii) "If so, is not this one of those cases in which, a definite law being broken by the penitent who refuses to fast before communion—even though his refusal is based upon conscientious grounds—I am obliged to refuse absolution?" This brings up several points of interest.

(*a*) When a disciplinary law falls into disuse without official repeal, and when, furthermore, it may fairly be held that its disuse does not conform to the conditions governing "reasonable" custom, so that it cannot be thought of as legitimately abrogated by contrary custom, must it be regarded as still having *per se* a claim upon conscience? The reply to this question seems to depend mainly upon the attitude of the canonical superior. If he is conscious of the disuse, and takes no step to reiterate the "law" or to enforce compliance, though no serious impediment stands in the way of his taking such steps, it would appear no longer to have any claim, *as a law of the Church*, upon conscience. Technically, the justification of this view might be based either upon a theory of "non-acceptance with tacit consent of the superior," or upon one of "tacit dispensation."‡ Some authorities (Sylvester, for example) would hold that disuse *without* the knowledge or consent of the superior would, if universal, and continued for a certain period, give the

* *Corp. Jur. Can.*, c. 3, D. iv; Aquinas *S.T.* i. 2, q. 97, a. 3; and commonly.

† We assume, with the Councils of Nicea (Canon 6), Constantinople (Can. 2) and Ephesus (Can. 8), and Article XXXIV. of 1563, the right of "a particular or national Church" to "ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority," even in the face of contrary rules on the part of other "particular" Churches.

‡ On "non-acceptance with tacit consent" see the various views in Alph. Lig., *Theol. Mor.*, i., §§ 136-139; on "tacit dispensation," *ibid.*, i., § 187, with Suarez, *de legg.*, vi., 13.

people a "prescription" against the law; this, however, is disputable, as theologians and canonists are not agreed as to whether "non-acceptance" by itself invalidates a law.* Questions arise, of course, as to the culpability of those who first disregard the law, and (if he has shown tacit consent) of the superior who connives at its disuse; what is commonly agreed, however, is that no blame could be attached to later generations who, on the ground of disuse with tacit consent, ignored the law. It no longer has any claim upon them by virtue of its original enactment as law, whatever claims it may have as a pious custom observed by a few.

(*b*) It might seem at first sight that what we have called "disuse with tacit consent" abrogates a law in exactly the same way as "reasonable custom." This, however, is not the case. Where it could be shown that "reasonable contrary custom" had abrogated a law, the custom, being "reasonable," would itself have obtained the force and obligation of law in conscience. To follow the law thus abrogated would be to disobey the custom, and this in itself would constitute a sin. In the case of mere disuse with tacit consent, however, the "contrary custom" has not necessarily established itself as reasonable; it may be legitimate and even laudable, therefore, still to follow the law, even though its force as law can no longer be recognized.†

From these considerations it would appear morally certain that whatever obligation the rule of fasting communion once had upon the conscience of Anglicans, it no longer has any such obligation as an ecclesiastical law. It is quite clear that canonical authority connives, and for a long time has connived, at its disregard, and has taken no steps to reiterate, still less to enforce, the obligation. "Tacit consent" has therefore been abundantly manifested. We can only conclude that a confessor would be wholly wrong in refusing absolution to a penitent merely on the grounds that the latter, in all good conscience, could not recognize the rule of fasting communion as binding upon him by virtue of ecclesiastical enactment.‡

If, however, the confessor were not convinced, by arguments such as those indicated above, that the principle had

* Thus, neither Suarez nor Jeremy Taylor will admit that the obligation of a law depends in any way upon "acceptance" (*de legg.*, i., 11, iii., 19, iv., 16; *Duct. Dub.*, iii., 1, rule 7); but each admits the possibility of "abrogation by tacit consent" (*de legg.*, vi., 27; *Duct. Dub.*, iii. 6, rule 7). *Cp.* Denzinger-Baunwart, *Enchiridion*, No. 1120.

† So Suarez, *de legg.*, vi., 19, admits the validity of dispensation without a *just* cause, though he feels strongly (*e.g.*, with Aquinas and others) that to give such dispensation would be sinful. Similarly, vi., 25, a law may be abrogated even though it be not proved to be unjust or useless. *Cf.* Taylor, *Duct. Dub.*, iii., 6, rule 7; Prümmer, *Theol. Mor.*, i., pp. 148, 149.

‡ *Cf.* Alph. Lig., *op. cit.*, i., § 98.

lost all obligation derivable from its original canonical promulgation, he would still have to recognize that the general tolerance of its disregard manifested by the authorities of the Church constituted this opinion as "probable." He would, therefore, still be bound, on the basis of the principle that a confessor must allow his penitent to follow a "probable" opinion, even though he himself (the confessor) disagrees with it,* to grant absolution, however strongly he might feel it his duty to attempt to bring the penitent to his way of thinking. The only possible exception to this conclusion would be if the principle was held by the confessor himself to be binding not merely as an ecclesiastical precept, but as a precept whose observance were essential to salvation.† Here he could not allow the penitent to disregard it, however probable he admitted the contrary opinion (that it was not for Anglicans even an operative ecclesiastical precept) to be; for, as will appear more fully in the following "case," a "probable" opinion may not be acted upon in matters directly affecting salvation. But it is so unlikely, in view of the tacit condonation of non-fasting communion in the English Church, that anyone could seriously take up this point of view, that the matter need not be further considered.

K. E. Kirk.

[*Note.*—Mr. Kirk's second article will appear in our August number, the three cases with which it deals being (*a*) Confession of Mortal Sin before Communion, (*b*) Birth Control, (*c*) Heretical Opinions. The method and principles to be applied to these latter cases are those which are enunciated in this first article; but further relevant principles emerge in the discussions.]

* Azpilcueta (Navarrus), *Ench. Conf.*, 26, 4; Alph. Lig., *op. cit.*, vi., 604, and commonly. The principle is an application of the more general rule, *lex dubia non obligat*, whose limitations will be more fully discussed in the next case.

† This could only be held if it could be shown *either* that the precept were also one of the natural or divine law; *or* that as a merely ecclesiastical rule it bound *sub gravi*, so that transgression of it with full knowledge and deliberate intent was *ipso facto* a mortal sin. For an ecclesiastical law to bind *sub gravi* it must (*a*) be concerned with a grave matter; (*b*) be seriously intended by the lawgiver; and (*c*) express its seriousness in explicit terms. (Suarez, *op. cit.*, iv., 18.)

(*To be continued.*)

MATTHEW PARKER

MAY 17 was the 350th anniversary of the death of Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, who took a great part in the settlement of the doctrine and discipline of the Anglican Church, and stabilized the situation after the violent oscillations under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Mary. His reputation depends upon things more memorable than the fable of the Nag's Head Tavern, and his name is honoured by scholars for his collection and preservation of national documents of priceless value. There are many details of his life, to be gathered from his letters and collected papers, which are possibly not well known; these may, I hope, justify an attempt to picture again this great and lovable character.

There is preserved in the bursary of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, a little roll of parchment, on which Parker entered the main events of his life up to the time of his consecration, together with some reflections at certain crises of his career; this roll was apparently not given to the College by Parker, but was procured and presented later by Archbishop Tenison. In it Parker states that he entered the College on September 8, 1522, in the seventeenth year of his age; this must be wrong, if, as he says, he was born on August 6, 1504; Strype's date for his entry is 1520, which is again incorrect, the proper date being 1521; this is proved by an endorsement in Parker's hand on a document of Stephen Gardiner, dated 1521, "hoc anno in festo nativitatis beatæ Mariæ M.P. accessit Cantabrigiam." He was entered "sub tutore R° Cowper, artium mro sed parum docto," and instructed in dialectics and philosophy, living first in St. Mary's Hostel and, after his appointment on the foundation as a Bible-clerk, in College; he became Fellow in 1527, proceeding to M.A. and the priesthood in the same year.

His studies in divinity and his acceptableness as a preacher won him such reputation as a scholar and divine that Cardinal Wolsey gave him an invitation, which was declined, to join the staff of the new Cardinal College at Oxford. In 1535 he began his connection with the Court, when he was appointed chaplain to Anne Boleyn and, later, Dean of her College of Stoke-by-Clare. There was evidently some Norfolk tie between the unfortunate Queen and Parker, as he hints at this in letters to Sir William Cecil: "yea, if I had not been so much bound to the mother, I would not so soon have granted to serve the daughter": "the truth is, as well for Almighty God's commandment, for that she

is now my prince, as for the last words that ever Her Majesty's mother spake to me concerning her, being her poor countryman, I have as much cause to wish well to Her Majesty as any other whatsoever." The execution of Anne made no difference to Parker's career, as in the following year he became chaplain to the King, and in 1544 was elected Master of Corpus as the result of royal commendatory letters. How Parker had spent his time at Cambridge we cannot say definitely, except that we may be sure from the copious quotations in his letters that he read with care the Fathers of the Church and the scriptures, and interpreted the latter with full consideration of the interpretation which the Fathers had put upon them. These studies probably prevented him from adopting the extreme views of some of the reformers, but did not prevent him from living on terms of intimacy and affection with them, and from running personal risks in doing so; thus he attended the martyr, Thomas Bilney, at his burning at Norwich in 1531, and defended his memory against the attacks of Sir Thomas More.

But besides being a man of religion and scholarship, he was pre-eminently a man of affairs and statesmanship. This is attested by his draft of some answers sent to the Lord Chancellor in 1539 to meet accusations presented against him by the townsmen of Clare, near to his College of Stoke; incidentally the document shows Parker's attitude towards ceremonies and relics to be not unlike that of Erasmus. He points out that the meaning of Easter processions was "to declare and testify openly to the world that they would henceforth follow Christ in their conversation." "Upon Relic-Sunday I declared to them what were the true relics which we should worship, and moved them not to put their trust in the holiness and virtue of men's bones and coats, whereof we have no certainty whether they be relics of saints or no; . . . to forget the mystery of Christ's cross and fall to the worship of the tree of the cross was a superstitious worship and reproved of" the Fathers. During the Pilgrimage of Grace he says that he thought it his duty to go to the town "to courage their hearts with God's word to serve their Prince in withstanding such traitors as was then risen, and in my sermon I inveighed against sedition and declared the authority of a Prince." Parker has endorsed the draft: "These articles objected were thus answered by M.P. and sent to the lord chancellor, which heard, he blamed the promoters and sent word that I should go on and fear no such enemies."

The same capacity for affairs was shown in every office which he held. At Stoke he drew up a new set of statutes for the college and founded a school for the singing-boys; at Corpus

he wrote out with his own hand inventories of the college goods and terriers of the estates, showing the amounts of the rents and the times of payments, and also revised the statutes; as Vice-Chancellor he devised a new method of keeping the University accounts. Most of these documents are now in the College library, having come there as part of the Archbishop's donation of his MSS. collection; this throws a light upon one feature of his character, his acquisitiveness for all kinds of official documents; in these days we should consider such papers as belonging to the office and not to the temporary holder of it, and should not deal with them as personal property; it may be that this practice did not prevail in Parker's day; if it did, he deliberately departed from it, as distrusting the safety of documents under such conditions; but that his action was not always approved is made likely by the final entry in the University Grace Book B, which runs: "Anno sequenti electus Mattheus parker S. theologie professor in vicecancellarium qui novum librum ratiociniorum fieri fecit et hunc in cistam communem imposuit": then there follows in a later hand this addition: "sed illinc surreptum et postea in manibus M.P." This document is now in the Corpus library.

It was inevitable that a man of Parker's capacity should become Vice-Chancellor; he had served not infrequently as deputy, and was elected Vice-Chancellor in 1545 and 1548. It has always been, and still is, the duty of the senior esquire bedell to inform the person elected, and we have the letters which were written to Parker by John Mere on the two occasions. Mere was a very old friend, of whose will Parker was subsequently a supervisor; and in that capacity he covenanted with the University for the foundation of the Mere commemoration sermon which is still preached on the Wednesday in Easter week, the day of Mere's death in 1558. Mere's letter of 1545 is worth quoting in part, as showing the gossip of the day and the terms on which Mere and Parker lived: "Right worshipful, in most hearty wise I have me commended unto your worship, certifying the same that it hath pleased the University to choose you unto the office of Vice-Chancellor, and M^r^ proctors be very desirous to have you at home to be admitted. Doctor Smith gave over his office on Saturday at ix of the clock and you were chosen on Sunday at iii of the clock. Doctor Ridley and Doctor Standysh were named unto the office, and it was thought that there hath been labouring for them this se'nnight or fortnight; but very suddenly, even on the Sunday, all the labouring for them was turned unto very importunate labour for M^r^ Atkinson vice provost; but he came nothing nigh you. . . . It was a very great house; the number of regents were four score and

xviii." The letter closes with messages to members of Parker's family by name and with this sentence: "Deus te servet: per cujus filium, ut rebus ex sententia gestis corpore pariter ac animo cito nobis redeas incolumis percupide optarem precaborque assidue." Attached to the letter is the record of the voting, as made at the time, showing seventy-nine votes for Parker, five for Ridley, eight for Standysh, and six for Atkinson.

Parker preserved a great amount of the official correspondence during his years of office, showing the great diversity of questions with which he had to deal; his chief correspondent was the Chancellor, Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester; among the matters arising are the provision for "decayed cooks," the eating of flesh in Lent, the proper pronunciation of Greek, prayers and processions for the success of the King's armies, and a long series of letters dealing with the performance by the students of Christ's College of a tragedy, in which the Chancellor alleged that certain Catholic doctrines, which His Majesty thought fit to retain, had been turned to ridicule. The most interesting document contains an account of an interview which Parker had at Hampton Court in 1546 with Henry VIII. It would appear that some members of the Court, remembering the profits made out of the monasteries, had cast envious eyes upon the lands and possessions of the Universities, and had persuaded the King to call for a return of these properties. In order to avoid the expense of an external commission, Parker secured the appointment of himself with two other heads of houses to make the return, and went to Court to present it. The King "diligently perused" it, "and in a certain admiration said to certain of his lords which stood by, that he thought he had not in his realm so many persons so honestly maintained in living by so little land and rent." After some questions had been answered, "he said to the lords, that pity it were these lands should be altered to make them worse: at which words some were grieved, for that they disappointed *lupos quosdam hiantes*. With which words we were well armed and so departed."

Parker has recorded also the speeches that he made to the senate, while Vice-Chancellor or while acting as deputy, to the number of over forty, and has given his reason for doing this as follows: "These prefacys with other foloweng spoken som tyme ex tempore somtyme premeditate wer thus reserved that yt might be avouched what words were propounded for y^{e} causes of congregations yf eny quarell had be*en* found therof as was seen otherwhiles by experyence: nam belua multorum capitum turba, genus querulum." The sting in the tail of this needs some justification, which may, perhaps, be found. In a speech which he dates as "when I was deputy for D^{r} Mallet," who

was Vice-Chancellor in 1537, he addressed the senate in these words: "Senatores, si senatores estis, ostendite senatoriam gravitatem"; some light is thrown upon this appeal by a document in one of the Parker MSS. entitled "a broyle upon y^e^ attempt of D. Glyn the Lawer for the election of a vice-chancellor contrary to y^e^ myndes and libertyes of the Regents." The document is neither signed nor dated, but it has plainly been drawn up by some deputy vice-chancellor, and as Dr. Mallet is mentioned as if he were in office, it may probably be of the same date as Parker's appeal. The whole story is too long to quote the whole, but the following extract is sufficient to justify Parker in his use of the word *belua* and in his appeal for *gravitas*. "M^r^ Cromforth dyde laye violent handes upon the sete where I satt and M^r^ Perne dyde pull me bakwarde by the hoode soo that yf the cheere had not beyn upholden by certayn that stode bye thaye hade overthroyn hit ande me. M^r^ Cromforth beyng at the dore of the regent howse at such tyme as I fryst sate in the cheere spak to certayn of his adherentes and companions in this conspirasye nowe playe the men and I will begyne ande soo ran thens as fast as he cowlde and played such parts as ys above specyfyed."

From 1553 to 1558 there is a break in the letters, and the question naturally arises as to what Parker was doing during that time. Mary's accession with its revival of Romanism meant that there was no room for Parker in the national Church; he was too convinced a reformer to be able to conform to the new conditions, and, to complete the impossibility, he had married in 1547; he had therefore to resign all his preferments and either to seek safety abroad or to lie hidden in England. His own account is: "After this I lived as a private individual, so happy before God in my conscience, and so far from being either ashamed or dejected, that the delightful literary leisure to which the good providence of God recalled me yielded me much greater and more solid enjoyment than my former busy and dangerous kind of life had ever afforded me." Not that his life was free from danger in his retirement; for he told Bacon a few years later that "flying in a night, from such as sought for me to my peril, I fell off my horse so dangerously, that I shall never recover it." Where he hid is unknown; it was probably somewhere in Norfolk, and possibly at Mattishall, his wife's native village, where by the Archbishop's direction a sermon is still preached every year by a member of the college; he had certainly leisure for his literary work and records in 1534 that he had "completed a metrical version of the Psalter into the vulgar tongue," and "written a defence of the marriage of priests against Thomas Martin." We might perhaps assign to

this period of seclusion and leisure some of the work that was ultimately used for the Bishops' Bible, completed and presented to Elizabeth in 1568; a document in the State Paper Office gives the names of those who were responsible for the revision of the different books, Parker's initials being attached to Genesis, Exodus, Matthew, Mark, and the epistles from 2 Corinthians to Hebrews. But against this conjecture we must set Parker's statement in a letter to Cecil that he passed "those hard years of Mary's reign in obscurity, without all conference or such manner of study as now might do me service."

The important point is that he remained in England, and thus did not get into close contact with the Continental reformed Churches; without doubt his solid reading of the Fathers would in any case have prevented him from adopting extreme views, but by staying in England he saved himself from the risk of contamination and was able in the critical time to take an English point of view. This caused a cleavage between him and the "exiles" in the days of his primacy, as we can see in the case of Edwin Sandys. Sandys and Parker were contemporaries at Cambridge and fellow heads of houses, Sandys being Master of Katharine Hall; his adventurous and quarrelsome career need not detain us, but it carried him through the sees of Worcester and London to the Archbishopric of York. It was while he was still at Worcester that he wrote a peevish letter to Parker, who had evidently complained of Sandys' management of his diocese: "I know your nature," he writes, "in showing of humanity, which I never misliked. And as I judge yours to be good, so I think ye will not utterly condemn all Germanical natures. For Germany hath brought forth as good natures as England hath. And if ye mean of us which were strangers in Germany for a time, sure I am there be some of us that be neither big-hearted nor proud-minded, but can in all simplicity seek the Kingdom of Christ. For my part I am right glad that ye know from whence it cometh that Canterbury is misliked."

The death of Mary on November 17, 1558, followed in a few hours by that of Cardinal Pole, brought to an end Parker's leisure; a man was needed to guide the national Church, and Parker's scholarship, business capacity, and sane views marked him out as the obvious primate; Elizabeth had confidence in her mother's chaplain, and on December 9 Sir Nicolas Bacon, the Lord Keeper, who had been at Corpus as Parker's younger contemporary, summoned Parker to London to see him and his brother-in-law, Sir William Cecil on "certain matters touching yourself, which I trust shall turn you to good." Parker's reply to this invitation, written between December 9 and 20, shows

that he realized what was on foot, but did not intend to give in without a struggle; he desires no post "above the reach of mine ability," and would prefer to work in the University; "to tell you my heart, I had rather have such a thing as Benet College is in Cambridge, a living of 20 nobles by the year at the most, than to dwell in the deanery of Lincoln, which is two hundred at the least." On December 30 Cecil summoned him to London in the Queen's name, and the question of the archbishopric was discussed. On March 1 Parker, who had now removed from Norfolk to Cambridge, wrote a last appeal to Bacon to be excused; his description of the importance of a right choice is worth quoting: "I shall pray to God ye bestow that office well. God grant it chanceth neither on arrogant man, neither on faint-hearted man, nor on covetous man. The first shall both sit in his own light, and shall discourage his fellows to join with him in unity of doctrine, which must be their whole strength; for if any heart-burning be betwixt them, if private quarrels stirred abroad be brought home, and so shall shiver them asunder, it may chance to have that success which I fear in the conclusion will follow. The second man should be too weak to commune with the adversaries, who would be the stouter upon his pusillanimity. The third man not worth his bread, profitable for no estate in any Christian commonwealth, to serve it rightly"; the letter recited every disqualification which Parker saw in himself for the office and closed with the appeal: "Put me where ye will else, and if, as far as my power of knowledge and of health of body will extend, I do not apply myself to discharge my duty, let me be thrust out again like a thief." Bacon replied to the effect that if he knew anyone who fulfilled Parker's description of the desired qualifications better than Parker did, he would prefer him. The appointment was finally settled in June, but it was not till December 17, 1559, that Parker was consecrated in Lambeth Palace Chapel. Parker's journal for that date records his consecration and continues: "Alas, alas, O Lord God, for what times hast Thou kept me. Now am I come into deep waters and the flood hath overwhelmed me. O Lord, I am oppressed, answer for me, and strengthen me with Thy free spirit; for I am a man, and have but a short time to live. Give me of Thy sure mercies."

It is not the purpose of this paper to enter in any detail into the history of Parker's primacy; he found ecclesiastical affairs in confusion, and he tried with all his might to bring order and unity into them, and in some measure he succeeded: religion was to him a part of statecraft, and must be dealt with accordingly; his policy is to be seen from some remarks of his to Cecil: "I must say, as Demosthenes answered, what was the chief

part in rhetoric, the second, the third: 'Pronunciation,' said he; so say I, Execution, execution, execution of laws and orders must be the first and the last part of good governance." Nor did he spare criticism of his suffragans when they failed to support him: "My Lord of London by experience feeleth and seeth the marks and bounds of these good sprights which, but for his toleration had been suppressed 5 or 6 years ago and had prevented all this unquietness now taken, and both his reputation better saved and my poor honesty not so foully traduced." Parker knew the importance of the Universities as the training ground for the ministry; he was aware that he was called in Cambridge "the pope of Lambeth," but he insisted on those in authority obeying his orders "to wear the cap appointed by injunction, to wear no hats in their long gowns, to wear a surplice with a non-regent hood in their quires at their colleges, according to the ancient manner there, to communicate kneeling in wafer-bread." This men must do, or they must go; but he had no feelings of resentment against those who preferred to go rather than to conform; and indeed his house became an asylum for many of the dispossessed.

His difficulties lay partly in the Protestantism of his suffragans, and partly in the conduct of the Queen. Elizabeth had probably no definite religious convictions, and certainly declined to take any positively Protestant position, so long as Mary Stewart was alive, as she did not want to antagonize her Roman Catholic subjects; for that reason, presumably, she retained the crucifix in her private chapel. Parker called it an "offendicle," and feared that public resentment might lead to "such visitation as Knox have attempted in Scotland, the people to be orderers of things." At the same time she worried the Archbishop to enforce discipline and to stifle extravagant preaching; he implored Cecil "not to stretch the cord too tight," and pointed out that it was unreasonable to expect that no matter of controversy in religion should ever be spoken of: "if the Queen's highness and the realm will be well served, she must bear with some manners of men: men cannot be angels." Parker could also sympathize with the clergy in their impoverished state: "I see them," he wrote to Elizabeth, "in such extreme poverty that, of pure conscience, I am driven to forbear of my ancient rights to ease them of their burthens, for the better maintenance of Christ's holy religion, which as it may be choked with overmuch in unconscionable men's hands, so it will fall to the ground amongst beggars, which shall set their whole care and force of mind, not to study, but to live."

This last statement is interesting as showing the importance which Parker set upon scholarship and a learned clergy; in

almost the last letter that he wrote to Cecil, three months before his death, he says that he is "devising ordinances for scholars to help the ministry." Here we can see the motives which inspired his generous foundation of scholarships at Corpus and elsewhere; the same motives led him to commit to the care of his college the magnificent library which he had collected; some people have questioned his right to own many of the treasures which he bequeathed; one can only say that he knew the value of them to posterity, and realized his obligation to ensure their safe custody: as he told Cecil, he did not mind in whose library such treasures were "so that they may be preserved within the realm, and not sent over by covetous stationers or spoiled in the poticaries' shops." But he was not a mere collector; he was a scholar and a student; he amassed, not to hoard, but to read, as he proved by his own editions of Matthew Paris and other chroniclers. Few men have combined so acceptably and so humbly the parts of the scholar, the man of affairs, and the ecclesiastic.

E. C. Pearce.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

It is with profound regret that we have read of the death of the Bishop of Oxford. The news reaches us too late for comment in this number; but we propose to say something in our August editorial of what the Church owes to him for his reconciling and constructive work, particularly in connection with the Doctrinal Commission.

We have received, as we go to press, a copy of the address recently given by the Archbishop of York to his Diocesan Conference last May, entitled *The Unity of the Church of England* (S.P.C.K. 2d.). It contains an eloquent plea for the abandonment of party strife and for a franker recognition in the various groups of the contribution which each has to make to the whole. We commend this weighty utterance to our readers.

CORRESPONDENCE

Sir,

I find myself at odds with Mr. Baker *de rerum natura*. After growing dissatisfaction, I was pulled up sharp by these words:

> It seems absurd to say it, but it is true that in the vast range of temperatures which is possible in the universe, all the evidence that we have seems to prove that anything that can be called self-conscious spiritual life only exists in connection with small weak physical organisms which live only between 96° and 106° F. (*Theology*, April, p. 205).

Then is God to be found, I asked, only within that range of temperature? I note a certain hesitation, which may reduce the sentence to a statement that we have no actual experience of spiritual life outside that range, but he proceeds to argue as if one negative proof were complete. Is there any such proof at all? We know that man, as he now is, can exist only within that range, but does the exclusion extend to others? One smiles at Edmond About's fantasy of a completely desiccated man revived after fifty years by a cautious infusion of moisture; but I think I have heard of low organisms completely frozen and afterwards thawed to activity. Man as he is could not exist on the surface of the moon or in the orb of the sun, but does that even tend to prove that self-conscious spiritual life is impossible at the absolute zero of temperature or in the flaming furnace of Aldebaran? An organism utterly unlike ours would be required, but what is there to prove the impossibility of such an organism? In order to show the congruity of the Incarnation, Mr. Baker seems to have stumbled into a new kind of anthropocentricism. But it is new only in form. "It seems to me," said Von Hügel, on an occasion when I was present, "the last word in human conceit to assume that man is the only rational creature." His purpose was to dispel a common prejudice against angelology or demonology, but the remark reaches far beyond that purpose.

I am more with Mr. Baker when he reinforces an unsound argument with polemic against the inverted "human conceit" which thinks it absurd to conceive the Incarnation as taking place in this "rather insignificant corner of the universe." To describe it as a corner is, of course, a permissible convention. The Newtonian physics, Mr. Baker suggests, made men feel ridiculously small; and to make them, with their new environment, the ultimate purpose of creation would certainly be *inconveniens*, to use the scholastic term, if we admit size into the scale of values. But what is the scale? If we assume God, the creator and ordainer of the universe, we must attribute to Him as much regard for the infinitesimal as for the Galaxy. We know how important is the complicated structure of the atom. An amœba living on this earth may be vastly more important than the greatest of the stars. There is nothing irrational in supposing that God determined, before the foundations of the world were laid, to become incarnate on this particular planet, and there to gather a group of persons more important than all the rest of the universe. The same thing might as reasonably have happened on an asteroid no bigger than an apple, inhabited by rational creatures of less than a thousand-millionth of an inch in stature. It might be a humiliation for rational creatures of a larger growth; but that would be altogether in the picture, for it is *ex hypothesi* a picture of the humiliation of God Himself.

We must shake off entirely the obsession of size. We shall possibly discover that size is illusion, a mental construction taken for infinity; when my thought travels in a moment from the point of the pen with which I am writing to a star beyond visibility, we may find that instantaneous transit a more valid measure of distance than the light-year of astronomy.

T. A. Lacey.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

St. John i. 23: The reference of the Baptist to Isa. xl. must have singularly impressed his hearers, for it is recalled by each of the four evangelists, although St. John may have been the only one to hear the words; unless we include Matthew amongst the publicans who went out to the Jordan. What did the passage in Isaiah mean to John the Baptist? The clearing of Jehovah's way in the prophecy is in allusion to "the well-known practice of Eastern monarchs in their progresses" (Cheyne, *ad loc.*). In the Synoptists the preparation of the way finds its spiritual fulfilment in the Baptist's preaching of repentance, and its effect on men's hearts. This is the actual experience of the Apostles who decide that Judas's successor must be one who has shared their witness from the time of John's Baptism (Acts i.). But is it not also possible that the event occurred shortly before the Passover in the month Adar when "roads and bridges were repaired, sepulchres were whitened anew" (H. D., *ad loc.*), in view of the pilgrims journeying to Jerusalem? If the Paschal preparations were in the Baptist's mind, it is easy to understand how the "Behold your God" of Isa. xl. 9 becomes "Behold, the Lamb of God!" of John i. 29, 36. The Baptist may have interpreted his quotation to those intimate disciples who subsequently followed Jesus, and, if so, with what force the incident would have come back when Christ our Passover had been sacrificed! The full quotation in Luke iii. 5, mentioning the crooked made straight and the rough smooth, lends colour to the Paschal allusion.

G. S. Richards.

NOTE

THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY

THE second volume of this history will receive the warmest possible welcome from theologians. Four topics may be singled out for special attention.

1. Thutmose III., whose obelisk stands on the Thames Embankment, appears in vivid colours as the first real empire-builder and world-hero. His campaigns against Syria, beginning April 19, 1479 B.C., can be followed step by step, almost day by day when the records are still extant. Never before in history had a single brain wielded the resources of a great nation with efficiency, pertinacity, and driving power, organizing its internal economy as well as developing it into a far-flung Empire. Thutmose III. is seen here as one of the great figures of world-history.

2. The universalism of the Egyptian Empire had its repercussions in theology, and Thutmose III. prepared the way for Ikhnaton. Biblical students are intensely interested in Ikhnaton's monotheism, for they feel that a monotheistic Moses may quite naturally have arisen in an Egypt which produced Ikhnaton. Professor Breasted does not, like some recent writers, minimize the religious significance of Ikhnaton. A few lines from the hymns addressed to Aton the sun-god with parallels from Psalm 104 will show his importance.

IKHNATON.	PSALM 104.
When thou settest in the western horizon of the sky,	19. The sun knoweth his going down.
The earth is in darkness like the dead;	20. Thou makest darkness, and it is night;
They sleep in their chambers,	Wherein all the beasts of the forest
Their heads are wrapped up,	do creep forth.
Their nostrils are stopped,	
And none seeth the other,	
While all their things are stolen,	
Which are under their heads,	
And they know it not.	
Every lion cometh forth from his den,	21. The young lions roar after their prey
The world is in silence,	And seek their meat from God.
He that made them resteth in his horizon. . . .	22. The sun ariseth, they get them away,
	And lay them down in their dens.
How manifold are thy works !	24. O Lord, how manifold are Thy works !
They are hidden from before (us),	
O sole God, whose powers no other possesseth,	
Thou didst create the earth according to thy heart	In wisdom hast thou made them all.
While thou wast alone.	

Note that the parallelism extends to the sequence of thought as well as to the phrasing.

While Ikhnaton saw in nature a universal God, overseeing all like the sun, our surviving sources do not allow us to ascribe to him any appreciable advance in ethical conceptions of the deity.

3. A classical scholar, returning to Homer after many years, is amazed to find Professor Bury writing the history of the twelfth century B.C. with the help of Homer. Agamemnon, Achilles, Priam and Hector are

all treated as historical characters. The argument that, if Achilles is said to have killed Hector with the help of Athene, we are not justified in omitting Athene and still accepting the fact of Achilles' prowess no longer holds good. The Olympian machinery is held not to interfere with the historical kernel of the story.

The heroes have been brought back by Professor Chadwick's *The Heroic Age*. The German sagas tell us about heroes who in similar fashion did great exploits and conversed with the gods. In their case Latin historical writers give us a prose account of the same men, and from the comparison of the two sources we can formulate canons of criticism by which to disentangle history from legend in the heroic age of Greece.

The *C.A.H.* does not mention Israel in this connexion, but the thought at once suggests itself that the Hebrew Patriarchs must be real men, and that Biblical science should be able before long to formulate canons of criticism by which to separate the historical kernel from the husks of legend and convention.

4. Dr. S. A. Cook's Essay on "The Rise of Israel" deserves to become classical. Nearly every sentence suggests a fruitful line of thought. The essay is written with consummate skill, insight, and caution. A radical critic himself, the writer sees the weakness of much modern work. "While the strongest arguments against the 'critical' position have indicated the weakness of elaborate 'reconstructions' based upon data which prove to be much more complicated than was thought, no alternative position and no other fruitful lines of enquiry have attracted serious attention."

Sure results are these: Not all Israel went into Egypt. The patriarchal narratives did not lead up to the Exodus, but give the traditions of those who stayed in Palestine. While the inrush of a desert tribe, fired by religious enthusiasm comparable to that of early Islam, is eminently plausible, yet archæology has discovered no break in Palestinian culture such as the traditional account of the Conquest would suggest. "Archæological discoveries have neither 'proved' nor 'disproved' the Old Testament record, but have placed it in an altogether new light." Dr. Cook seems to suggest that religious advance, hitherto most marked in Egypt, was checked there and passed over to Palestine.

The conclusion of the essay is supremely important both in what it says and in what it omits. "For the early history of Palestine the Old Testament cannot be used as it stands. The ordinary histories and text-books are necessarily obliged to utilize the fruits of modern research, and present each some particular and possible reconstruction. But such are the internal difficulties and the unavoidable differences of opinion that it has seemed to the present writer undesirable to attempt yet another reconstruction which the progress of archæological discovery might any day radically modify or overthrow. . . . Truth of idea rather than of fact is the characteristic feature of the biblical history; and the ideas, being really independent of and separable from the form in which they have been expressed, are permanent, and capable of re-expression."

W. K. L. Clarke.

THE ODES OF SOLOMON

A FURTHER SELECTION RENDERED INTO ENGLISH VERSE, WITH SUGGESTED TUNES, BY S. P. T. PRIDEAUX, D.D.

[NOTE.—The translator wishes to renew his grateful thanks to the most Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and Dr. Rendel Harris, for their kind and courteous permission to use their translations and editions. The earlier renderings were published in THEOLOGY, ix. 219 *f.* (October, 1924), and x. 46 *ff.* (January, 1925).]

XX.

THE PRIEST

PRIEST of the Lord am I,
Within His court I stand,
To Him I offer sacrifice
As He doth me command.
Not as men serve the flesh
Or in the world have part,
His sacrifice is righteousness
And purity of heart.

Blameless present thy soul;
Thy neighbour do not wrong;
Deceive him not, nor take for thine
What doth to him belong.
His life is as thine own,
Nor bought nor sold can be;
His needs are thine, his weal and woe
Entrusted are to thee.

Freely be clothed with grace;
Come, enter Paradise;
Make thee a garland from its tree
And let thy songs arise.
The Lord shall be thy rest,
His glory go before,
His kindness and His grace be thine
In truth for evermore.

Tune, E.H., 644: "Ich halte treulich still."

XXI.

LIGHT

My arms I lifted high,
To Christ I turned my face,
For He has cast my bonds from me
And saved me by His grace.

Uplifted by His help
I bade all darkness flee,
And, clothed with light, my members found
From pain and sorrow free.

I thought upon the Lord
And ever stronger grew;
In glory incorruptible
His fellowship I knew.

Uplifted in His light
I served before His throne,
In His Presence I sang His praise,
Confessed Him Lord alone.

My heart was filled with joy,
My happiness ran o'er;
With swelling heart and bursting lips
I'll praise Him evermore.

Tune, E.H., 485: Sandys.

XXV.

The Refuge

From bonds set free to Thee I fled,
For Thou art my salvation,
My helper and my strong right hand,
My God, my jubilation.

My enemies Thou didst restrain
And I no more shall see them;
Thy face was with me, and Thy grace
Did give me power to flee them.

By many counted but as dross,
Despisèd and forsaken,
Thyself didst come and raise me up
With help and power unshaken.

Thou gav'st a lamp on either hand,
All shall be light around me;
Thy Spirit clothed me and did loose
The chains of death that bound me.

For Thy right hand did lift me up
And sent for sickness healing;
Thy righteousness gave holiness,
Thy truth in power revealing.

Thy gentleness did make me great,
My foes are fled for ever,
And in Thy name I'll make my boast
Whose rest has ending never.

Tune, E.H., 490: St. Columba.

XXVI.

Praise

I praised the Lord for I am His,
And I will speak His holy song;
I hold His harp within my hands,
To Him my heart and soul belong.

I'll cry to Him with my whole heart;
With all my members tell His praise;
I'll sing His rest, nor silent be,
But hymns of high thanksgiving raise.

From east to west His praises sound,
Both south and north confess His name;
The hilltops His perfections show,
Their utmost bounds echo the same.

Yet who can pen a worthy psalm ?
Or read the psalms that He doth write ?
Who find salvation for his soul,
And train his soul to walk aright ?

And who may utter what He saith,
The wonders of the Lord make plain ?
He would be one himself with God
Could man to such a height attain.

Enough it is to know and rest,
And in His rest the singers stand,
Like brimming streams which flow to help
All those who ask on either hand.

Tune, E.H., 243: Solothurn.

XXIX.

Hope

As His praise is, so He made me;
As His goodness, so His gift;
As His mercies, so He raised me;
As His beauty, did uplift;
From the depths of hell He drew me;
All my foes He did abase;
From the mouth of death He took me;
Justified me by His grace.

I believed in His Anointed,
For I saw He was the Lord;
Signs He showed me, light He lent me,
Gave to me His mighty sword
To subdue the people's vauntings,
Make the mighty bow the knee,
Warring by His Word, and winning
By His power the victory.

As the chaff before the east wind
So He made my foes to fly;
I did praise Him—Hallelujah!
Hallelujah! Lord most High.
Tho' the son of His handmaiden,
Tho' a servant, weak and frail,
In the Lord my hope is rooted,
And in Him I shall not fail.

Tune, E.H., 301: Hyfrydol.

XXX. AND XXXII.

LIVING WATERS

Fill ye waters at your pleasure
From the fountain of the Lord;
Living waters now are opened
For the thirsty, by His Word.

Take your rest beside His fountain,
Sit you down, no further roam;
Fair it is and pure and restful,
Sweeter than the honeycomb.

From the Lord's lips see it flowing,
From the Lord's heart is its name;
All unknown and all undreamed of
Boundless and unseen it came.

Blessed they who of its waters
Drink, and find their rest thereby,
Singing praises for His bounty
To the Son of God most High.

There is joy to all the blessed
Now from sin and death set free,
Light from Him who dwells within them,
Who is Truth eternally;

He is strong and He is holy,
Son of God who rules the height,
Firm He stands unmoved for ever
In the everlasting might.

Tune, E.H., 568: "Daily, daily."

REVIEWS

THE INNER LIFE. Essays in Liberal Evangelicalism. Second Series. By Members of the Church of England. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 6s.

The emergence of the Liberal Evangelicals as a distinct group within the Church of England is a fact of very real interest. They have done what the younger High Churchmen of the *Lux Mundi* School did in their generation, resolutely, though with all possible consideration for the feelings of an older generation, refusing to be limited by prescriptions and sanctions to which their minds and consciences no longer adhere. And there are resemblances in the subject-matter of the divergence. The Oxford theologians of the late eighties were prepared to accept the Darwinian theory in its main lines, the methods and some of the results of the Higher Criticism, and a spiritual attitude towards life which tended to distrust sharp cleavages between religious and worldly usages and the ruling-out of particular activities. All these phenomena reappear in the uprising of Liberal Evangelicalism. An article in the January *Churchman*, by the Rev. W. S. Hooton, a Conservative Evangelical, entitled "Religious Fashions," might be taken as an unfavourable comment on the inclinations of his more Liberal brethren, though it is with no one group that he is concerned.

Polemics are not wholly absent from this present volume, but they are not in the forefront, and for this reason, as well as for others, it is a regrettable addition to existing differences when Canon Guy Rogers says in the Introduction that Liberal Evangelicals differ from—even though it be only some—Anglo-Catholics in their view of the nature of God. I cannot see that any Anglo-Catholic need find himself regarding the authors of the first three essays in this book as defenders of a doctrine of God's nature which he could not accept. Canon Storr's belief that God, not within a time-series that had a beginning, but eternally, finds self-expression in a universe, though not one in which he will carry all his readers with him, opens no field of disagreement, any more than does the rest of his vigorous statement of theistic belief, as to the kind of God Christians believe in. The same is true of the Bishop of Birmingham's exposition of natural processes as the home of creative divine activity, while all Christians might find themselves at one in Mr. Grensted's most admirable essay "The Divine Quest."

But before passing on to the next group of articles I feel bound to say that the treatment which Dr. Barnes gives to the

doctrine of Christ's Deity and of the Trinity seems to me very unfortunately worded. He says that while Christ draws us to God, yet "the divine Christ and the Divine Spirit are not two Gods, two separate centres of consciousness, though many popular hymns and some modern theologians countenance this heresy." Merely noting the unfortunate ambiguity of the phrase "The Divine Spirit," which may mean God or, distinctively, the Father (it cannot in the context mean the Holy Spirit), and the curious inconsistency which gives to the second "divine" a capital letter which the first lacks, one may point out that while "separate," if the word be taken to mean isolated from one another, is, of course, an expression to be condemned, the phrase "two centres of consciousness" cannot legitimately be described as heretical. It is not clear what the Bishop means. On the whole, he seems to me to stand with the late Dr. Rashdall in denying more than one centre of consciousness, and therefore in disagreement with the Bishop of Manchester, who in *Christus Veritas* uses the phrase "three centres of one consciousness," which with great exactness combines the notions of unity and distinction. If Dr. Barnes denies all distinctions in the Godhead to which the adjective "personal" would be appropriate, and by his further sentences, "There is a true and complete unity in the Godhead. The Word made Flesh in Christ Jesus was not a Personality separate from God," would allow no personal relationship of the Word to the Father, he is out of accord both with the New Testament and with the steady tradition of Christian theology. In general I should say of this essay on "The Rise and Growth of Man's Spiritual Consciousness" that, despite the interest with which it invests the story of man's progressive discoveries, a fuller description might have been expected of distinctive points in the Christian consciousness of God. Soteriology, both as to the Cross and as to forgiveness, is resolved too narrowly into moralism, and the higher peaks of the spiritual consciousness, as climbed in mystic contemplation or in sacramental communion, are left unnoticed.

Of the four articles dealing with the ground, the motive, and the character of Christian moral practice which follow Mr. Grensted's, that by the Principal of St. Aidan's on "The Indwelling Christ" is to be received with real gratitude. There is both a beauty and a comprehensiveness in Mr. Howard's treatment of the ways whereby Christ unites Himself with men, and of the results that follow in every tract of human life, which make it, with the possible exception of Mr. Grensted's contribution, the most attractive piece of writing in the book. It lacks neither imagination nor strength. Mr. R. W. Howard deals with "Witness and Service" in a practical and appealing

way, and again I feel that the older Evangelicalism with its characteristic qualities is not lost in its modern form. The "personalism" of the modern school is strongly represented in Canon Woods' essay, "Christ Our Example." Through it sounds a clear note of insistence on our need to think about life and about God as did the Jesus of the Gospels. It would almost stand for a restatement of the meaning of conversion. It is more satisfactory than Dr. Raven's chapter on "Sin and Salvation," which, as one would expect, contains a good deal that is both striking and deeply religious, but is not particularly well-balanced, and talks about the confessional in a manner which does not suggest any real mastery of the subject.

The next four essays may be grouped together. They represent, taken as a whole, a definite break with certain older Evangelical traditions in regard to the relation of the Christian individual and the Christian society to the world. On the one hand, such a reaction of Christian idealism on the world-order as "Copec" would wish to express is definitely approved. On the other hand, the old idea of what separation from the world involves is frankly, though with rightly careful statement, abandoned. Neither Canon Buchanan, who writes on "Separation from the World," nor Dean Burroughs, whose subject is "The Church in the World," belongs to the left wing, which makes the general attitude of each specially significant. The Dean's article is of very high merit. As an Evangelical Humanist he stands not alone, but as the worthy leader of a group which owes very much to him; indeed, he has done more than is perhaps always recognized as a liaison-officer between Evangelicalism and the wider consciousness of the Church. Mr. G. C. L. Lunt, dealing with "The Individual and Fellowship," is good on the importance of the corporate idea, and on the sacraments in relation to the Great Fellowship. But I think it would be far from easy to extract any theology of the Church from his article. After all, fellowship can hardly be taken as the only note of the Church, and while we fully recognize that we cannot set up barriers to the ways in which the Spirit expresses Himself, it does not follow that no one method is more normal than others.

There are three other contributions. Mrs. Rogers writes excellently on "The Devotional Use of the Bible," Canon Dwelly rather too breathlessly on "Prayer." There is rather too much in the article, and it is not always as well said as one would expect Canon Dwelly to say it. And the sentence in which "the Christ" is classed with a number of others from Abraham to Lord Radstock, who have experienced "very definite breaks in upon the consciousness, impelling them to

communion with God," is one which suggests the Gospel of St. Mark as little as it does the Creed of Nicaea. The final essay, by the Rev. G. H. Harris, on "The Place and Purpose of the Holy Communion in the Christian Life," is of mixed quality. A deep reverence for and delight in the Eucharist is apparent, a spirit in which we all could feel at one. But to points in the controversial passages I should take considerable exception. The phrase "special presence" is certainly not a happy one, but it does not follow that a special connection between our Lord's presence and the Eucharistic elements is to be repudiated. And it is astonishing that Mr. Harris, who is not unacquainted with the doctrine of the early Church, should allow himself to say that "in any of the less absolute [besides the theory of Transubstantiation] statements of the connection or union of the elements with the Body or Personality of the Lord, the nature of the Sacrament is overthrown, and the relation of God to matter is violated." I am bound to say that with the memory of the Eucharistic tradition in doctrine from the second century onwards to check this sentence, it suggests an arrogancy of judgment which Mr. Harris might both have realized and avoided. And while he quite rightly warns us against an undue stress upon the experience which certain devotional practices evoke or mediate, as though thereby an adequate justification were given, he has not tried to probe the connection between sacramental practice and sacramental belief. After all, the revival of the sense of the importance of sacramental fellowship has come to pass in the Church of England mainly through those whose Eucharistic doctrine would meet with considerable disapproval from the author of this essay.

Here, then, is a group with a strong group-consciousness and contributions to make from which we all may and should benefit. It is not likely to mould the Church according to its own pattern, but it is the most substantial assistance which Evangelicals have given towards the enrichment of the whole Church-consciousness of the communion to which they belong.

J. K. Mozley.

Elizabethan Episcopal Administration. An Essay in Sociology and Politics. By W. P. M. Kennedy, M.A., Litt.D. 3 vols. Mowbray and Co. £3 3s.

The Alcuin Club has never more deserved the gratitude of scholars than when it has set itself to produce in their practical entirety the official documents which alone can light up the dark places of Anglican development. Such documents

belong as of right to students of differing views, who approach the matters in debate from correspondingly various angles, and are thus at liberty to arrive at their several conclusions. Let it be acknowledged that the typography is in itself a gladdening of the eyes; and when to this is added a wonderful care in revision (" dices " on p. xcvi looks as if it should be " dicers "), there still remains a meed of gratitude which it is very difficult to render in full.

" Frere and Kennedy " has come to be in the same class of indispensableness as " Gee and Hardy," with the added distinction of being out of print. The enterprise began with Dr. Frere's essay on the theory, history, and practice of Episcopal and other Visitations (Alcuin Club, xiv.), followed by two volumes of the documents of 1558 to 1575 (xv., xvi.), in the first of which Dr. Frere had the aid of Dr. Kennedy, who henceforth carries on the task alone; but not without a graceful dedication of his work to his late colleague, now seconded for Visitation duties of his own.

So it is the purpose of Alcuin Club, xxv–xxvii, to carry on the investigation from 1575 to 1603, and the documents here printed (many of them for the first time) range from William Blethyn's Constitutions for Llandaff Cathedral, January 30, 1576, to the articles of Richard Bancroft's second Visitation of the diocese of London in 1601. The student may thus be sure that the relevant muniments of the whole period are all here, that the arrangement and the apparatus could hardly be improved, and that nothing has been omitted by the printers in order to enhance the value of all this store of well-ordered material. The student is not likely to grumble at the inevitable repetitions. It is a price which he pays willingly for the sake of completeness.

With this recognition gratefully made—and it can hardly be exaggerated—the student turns to Professor Kennedy's masterly review of the whole series. It gives him first a conspectus of the bishops of the period. Parker died at the junction of the earlier and the later sets of documents, and it is admitted (in a discussion on patronage) that he " needs no praise. His hands were clean." The period hardly produced the like of Parker; but some of the lesser men still need and deserve a certain measure of justification. Sandys may be taken as an example of conscientious diocesans, whose administration brought upon them a world of calumny from the like of Sir John Bourne and his recusant circle in Worcestershire, but who held steadily on their administrative way. There are Visitation articles of his for Worcester in 1569, for London in 1571, and for York in 1578. Whitgift, of course, occupies more space.

Among many transcripts now printed for the first time are his three sets, two of articles and one of injunctions, when he began to visit the diocese and the cathedral of Worcester in 1577. The articles are a "find" in the Dean and Chapter's *Liber Canonum* (they number it A. xiv.), and the attribution to Whitgift, though cautiously expressed by Dr. Kennedy, can hardly be doubtful. The editor points ingeniously to the reference in Article 32 (p. 59) to "prophesying," a practice hitherto unspecified as such, but now clearly connected with "secret meeting," and as much under suspicion as going to mass. Elizabeth herself used it officially in her letter to the bishops of May 7, 1577. But Whitgift's quick process to Lambeth brings him into our series as an active metropolitical Visitor. Bath and Wells realized it in 1583; Chichester in 1585; Salisbury in 1589; Ely and Llandaff in 1590; Exeter in 1593; Ely and Salisbury again in 1597; and St. Asaph in 1600.

So it is natural for minds less capable than Professor Kennedy's of rising to the high politic of the Elizabethan settlement, to test these activities on their personal and local side. Was a bishop a bad diocesan because he cannot be traced in the act of formal Visitation? It would be scant justice to affirm on this ground that he was; and yet the charge may have a fair semblance of reasonableness in some cases. Take Thomas Bilson—a great scholar, with the unique office of giving the final polish to King James's Version. In our period (as Dr. Kennedy's tables so clearly show) he had opportunities, and indeed obligations, of visiting the diocese of Worcester once, and the diocese of Winchester thrice; but it seems that he evaded them all. Suppose that in his brief period as Bishop of Worcester he had issued such articles; what effect would the action have on our estimate of his episcopal conscience? Very little, because certain *detecta* and *comperta* of various kinds come in there to affect our judgment. I write on board ship, and Bilson's register is safely locked up in Worcester; but I know that its pages give no sign of his having entered the confines of the diocese at all. Most of his acts were completed in London "in aedibus domini doctoris Rydley" (*i.e.*, Thomas Ridley, Chancellor of the diocese of Winchester). Nor would it be easy to forget the circumstances in which Bilson obtained the Worcester see. Strype prints a letter in which Bilson tells Cecil that he had declined the deanery of Windsor, because his oath as provost of Winchester compelled him to reside there ten months in each year, and the Queen, he felt, might be angry if her Dean were absent so much. But the See of Worcester was vacant; and he would like it, because (though he does not say it in so many words) you need not go there at all.

Or take Bilson's predecessor at Worcester, the unfortunate Richard Fletcher. Dr. Kennedy prints such Visitation matter of his as is available—two mere torsos, one for Worcester in 1593, and one for London in 1595. There are signs that Fletcher did set foot in Worcestershire, and even saw Hartlebury; but his register makes it clear that most of his functions as bishop were exercised "in domo solite sue habitacionis infra villam de Chelsea in comitatu Middlesexie"; for Fletcher was Lord High Almoner, and the Court cannot be slighted. No visitational activity can cancel out such neglect.

But let us come to a more reputable case and return to Whitgift. He received a great welcome to Worcestershire, and he repaid it by a real love for the county and a readiness to reside in it, mostly at his castle of Hartlebury or his manor of Grimley; even his duties in the administration of the Welsh marches did not greatly detach him; if I remember rightly, there is just one document in his register which dates itself at Ludlow. Whitgift, as we have seen reason to believe, held a Visitation of the diocese in 1577, issuing some forty-two articles, of which just half are questions as to "your minister," his knowledge, his diligence, his habit of life. The issue of so searching a document does not really settle the adequateness of Whitgift as a diocesan. You would need *detecta* and *comperta* of some sort. You cannot see him acting as a county magistrate, as you can see the Jacobean bishops—Babington, Parry, Thornborough—and consult the rolls of quarter sessions about his magisterial efficiency. But his ordination lists are there, and they throw a curious light on the mentality of one who was clearly anxious for a high standard of clerical conscientiousness. Men could come to Whitgift and be ordained at any odd time and any convenient place. He was Bishop of Worcester from April, 1577, to September, 1583, and in that time he held sixty ordinations; but the total of his ordinands was only seventy-six. Mostly the men came to him one at a time, and quite frequently were ordained deacon and priest straight away. The appearance of things belies either care or method.

So all theories of ecclesiastical policy, and all efforts to keep Church and State loyal to a settlement, and all the convictions so ably expounded by Dr. Kennedy about the wastefulness that results from nonconformity, whether papistical or puritan, have to be tested at last by their practical working. They stand or fall by the honesty of the personal agents.

ERNEST WORCESTER.

THE ANGLICAN REVIVAL: STUDIES IN THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. By the Rev. Yngve Brilioth, D.Phil. Lecturer in Church History in the University of Upsala. Longmans. 16s.

This is an interesting study of the Oxford Movement from a new standing-point. We have had every sort of estimate, from eulogists and detractors, from Roman Catholic biographers and Protestant agitators, from contemporaries and successors, but a special interest must attach to an estimate from without of what was a typically English movement. M. Thureau-Dangin wrote, some eleven years ago, as sympathetic a review as could be given on a foreign Romanist. Now we have a similar judgment from a Swedish Lutheran. Dr. Brilioth has studied his subject with great care. There are very few authorities on it which he has not perused. He has entered into the spirit of the times and of the men as very few foreigners are able to do, and, if his conclusions will not satisfy them, few who understand the Oxford revival of religion will fail to profit by what he has written.

The Bishop of Gloucester adds to the book the distinction of a preface, with a charming touch of sympathy for the beautiful austerity of the early Tractarians, who were so closely associated with some of the most attractive parts of his diocese. It seems to the Bishop that the Oxford Movement "has always been academic," and that "its influence would always be limited to the cultivated class." This view will hardly be held by those who have studied at all closely the work of Hook at Leeds, or Gray at Helmsley, the Kebles in their country livings, or Gregory at Lambeth, still less by those to whom the Anglo-Catholicism of to-day seems the direct and legitimate successor of those who published the Anglo-Catholic Library more than half a century ago. But, on the other hand, all will recognize the acute wisdom which belongs to Dr. Headlam in such sentences as these in which are expressed the services of the Oxford Movement to the cause of the reunion of Christendom, and to the *rapprochement* between religion and "modern thought." Thus the Bishop says:

"The individualism in religion which made any corporate reunion appear quite unnecessary has everywhere passed away, and although we may find it difficult to agree upon the definition of a Church, or to find a means of uniting the scattered elements of Christianity, yet it is because of the new impetus to corporate Christianity which the Oxford Movement first started that we are all, at any rate, desiring to do this."

Thus for reunion; and thus for "modern thought":

"Dr. Brilioth quotes somewhere a statement of Canon Storr in which he says that the religious mind is indifferent to truth. That again is a most unjust judgment. Truth may be sought in various ways. The

religious mind is as keen for truth as the mind of science, but it is not every mind that can see truth from every side, and it is no more just to say that the religious man who is indifferent to scientific truth is careless about truth than that the scientific man who is indifferent to religious truth is careless. There will always be many minds that are narrow in their outlook: there are just as many in the scientific world as in the religious. But, as a matter of fact, it is those who have inherited the traditions of the Oxford Movement who have done more than any other body of men to reconcile religion with science, criticism, and modern thought."

Dr. Brilioth's book deserves a longer review than we can give it. We must content ourselves, mainly, with stating his point of view, and with making a few corrections for a second edition or for the book as it will doubtless appear in the writer's own country. His point of view is eminently sympathetic. He sees what good men the Tractarians were, how deep their piety, how devoted their lives. He probably agrees with very many of their tenets, and certainly with their loyalty to the past. But, on the other hand, while he traces with great care their theological ancestry, he arrives at the conclusion, which a more extended study of English history than his could not warrant, that the Anglicanism of the Movement was to a large extent a new creation. He gives us, to describe it, the word "Neo-Anglicanism." Indeed, it seems to him the religion of a short period. He would restrict it practically to twelve years (1833–1845). The succession to the present moment seems to him unproved, highly disputable, indeed contrary to fact. This restriction is really unjustified. The history of doctrine and the actual lives of men prove conclusively that there is no breach between Guest and Overall, Andrewes and Laud, Sheldon and Sancroft, Sharp and Dr. Johnson, Bishop Jebb and Alexander Knox, Pusey and Keble, Liddon and R. M. Benson, Francis Paget and H. S. Holland, Gore and Frere and Waggett and Stone. The Anglo-Catholicism of to-day undoubtedly represents the Tractarianism of seventy years ago, as that did the Anglo-Catholicism of Charles I. and Queen Anne. There are many differences between the men of the succession we have given, but there is no more acute divergence than there was between W. G. Ward—to whom Dr. Brilioth devotes considerable attention—and the Tractarian leaders. Dr. Brilioth has perhaps forgotten what Cardinal Newman said to Mr. Wilfrid Ward: "Your father was never a High Churchman, never a Tractarian, never a Puseyite, never a Newmanite." When we differ from Dr. Brilioth in his historical view of the position of the Tractarians, we must also point out that his very full, very fair, and on the whole very kindly opposition to their theology is guided by two dominating

principles of exposition in his mind, his firm adherence to the Lutheran doctrine of justification and his rejection of the ancient doctrine of Apostolic Succession. In regard to the latter we must express our regret that he seems to attribute a want of candour to that most candid of historians, Mr. C. H. Turner. We need not discuss either of these positions of Dr. Brilioth. He does not agree with the Tractarians, and he thinks that they were narrowminded and unhistorical. That is all we need say. Yet in spite of that he reviews their lives and their opinions with a generous friendliness. He sees, and he conveys, the romance of their story. He understands the beauty of their ideal. He recognizes the charm, and the divergence, in the individual character of each. In the presentation of the facts there is, of course, very little that will be new to English readers, and little if anything to correct. The most novel part of the book is the very careful analyses of the literary work of the different leaders, of the "fundamental forms" of their piety, of the doctrine, in particular, of justification, of mysticism and sacramentalism. But all through he turns round and about his cardinal disagreement with what he believes to be—it is a favourite word of his—their "static view of the Church." It would be more accurate to call their view historical.

We must pass by many passages we have marked for praise and suggest a few needed alterations. G. Kelway should be C. Bishop Marsh of Peterborough was hardly "a typical High Churchman." Keble describes Charles I. as nursed "to more than kingly thought," not "kindly," and the poem was published four, not six, years before the Assize Sermon. In 1833 at Oxford it was not "incumbent on every member of the teaching profession to take Holy Orders," nor were lectures in St. Mary's "an unheard-of novelty." When the "radical fraction" which had "grown up" is twice mentioned, surely "faction" is meant. The Hebdomadal Council was never "the chief teaching body in the Church." Mr. R. F. Wilson's benefice was Rownhams. The quotation (p. 320) from Dr. Pusey should be "life of the world," not "lips." There are several passages which show that Dr. Brilioth does not understand that Catholic doctrine of succession which he thinks to be a "suffocating snare."

W. H. Hutton.

NOTICES

Reviews and Studies, Biblical and Doctrinal. By F. J. Badcock, D.D. Longmans, Green and Co. 7s. 6d.

It is well that these valuable essays should appear in a permanent form, for they deserve more careful study than that which is often thought sufficient for articles in magazines and reviews. Especially interesting are the New Testament studies, though the writer makes too little use of modern critical methods which throw so much light on the origin and dependence of the varying accounts of the same incident recorded in the different gospels. Unfortunately Dr. Badcock has not compared the vision at the Transfiguration with the similar visions of two men in dazzling apparel, vouchsafed to the women at the sepulchre and the apostles at the ascension, or perhaps he would have hesitated so definitely to identify Elijah with John the Baptist in spite of his own disclaimer (John i. 21). One who goes forth "in the spirit and power of Elijah" (Luke i. 17, *cf.* 2 Kings ii. 15, Ecclus. xlviii. 12) would seem rather to represent Elisha, while certainly it was Elisha who first prescribed baptism in Jordan (2 Kings v. 10). Our Lord's own words imply that it is the Son of Man Himself who is Elijah (Mark ix. 11-3) and not another. The writer is probably correct in refusing to date St. Paul's Apostolic Commission from his conversion, which was, however, a call to labour, but it seems unsafe to date it from the vision in the temple at Jerusalem. "I will send thee" (Acts xxii. 21) suggests the future, and though Dr. Badcock tries to minimize the importance of this, he was first "separated" for such a mission at Antioch (Acts xiii. 2, *cf.* Rom. i. 1), the word for "send" used in this narrative being very frequently employed as a synonym for that from which we get the name "apostle," which indeed is first used of Paul during this journey (Acts xiv. 4, 14). Even, however, if we cannot always accept his conclusions Dr. Badcock's studies are always suggestive, and, whether he is dealing with philosophical or exegetical problems, they will reward the most attentive reading. W. Lockton.

Speculum Mentis, or The Map of Knowledge. By R. G. Collingwood. Oxford University Press. 12s. 6d.

Mr. Collingwood has given us quite one of the freshest and most stimulating pieces of philosophical writing that we have had in recent years. All through the book we feel ourselves in touch with an alert mind, and whatever be our verdict on the "map of knowledge," we must do homage to the quality of the mind that has attempted its production.

In the Prologue, Mr. Collingwood lays it down as the fundamental principle of Christianity that the only life worth living is the life of the whole man, every faculty of body and soul unified into a single organic system. To suggest that the supreme achievement of the medieval mind was some such synthesis, some such complete and unified life, whilst the radical defect of the modern mind is the lack of it, is to open up a fascinating line of thought. If the secret of our present distress lies in the fact that we are wrecks and fragments of men, knowing not where to take hold of life and how to begin looking for the happiness which we know we do not possess, then clearly man must unify his life somehow,

either positively, by bringing every activity into harmony, or negatively, by suppressing all but one. It is suggested that the former was the medieval way; the latter that of the Renaissance. Hence ever since the negative aspect of the Renaissance culminated in the eighteenth century, it has been clear, our author thinks, that some kind of revived medievalism, some new interpretation of Christianity, was the only hope for the world's future.

Mr. Collingwood's book is the outcome of a long-growing conviction that the only philosophy that can be of real use to anybody at the present time is a critical review of the chief forms of human experience, a new Treatise of Human Nature philosophically conceived. The whole argument of his Prologue demands this, and *Speculum Mentis* is the outcome. If the field of human experience appears divided into provinces, art, religion, science, history, philosophy; each in some sense a kind of knowledge; five types, in short, of experience, each claiming not only to give truth, but to give the absolute or ultimate truth concerning the nature of the universe, to reveal the secret of existence and to tell us what the world really and fundamentally is, then clearly these types must be in some way related, and the discovery of the exact nature of their relationship would give the key to any attempted synthesis. If our supreme task is to win back a complete and undivided life, conceived of as an activity which is at once art and religion and science, and so forth, then a map of knowledge, on which every legitimate form of human experience should be laid down, its boundaries determined, and its relations with its neighbours set forth, must be constructed.

In the issue Mr. Collingwood convinces us that such a map of knowledge is impossible. There are no autonomous and mutually exclusive forms of experience. Their separateness is an illusion. But can we go further and say that each form is at bottom identical with all the others? Are the various countries on the map variously-distorted versions of one and the same country? Those who will allow themselves to be carried along chapter after chapter by Mr. Collingwood's persuasive dialectic through the provinces of art, religion, science, and history to philosophy may in the end be convinced by him that the answers to these questions are in the affirmative. If, however, they find themselves in violent opposition to our author's conclusions, if all his persausive eloquence fails to convince them, for example, of the exact significance of religion in relation to art and philosophy, or the exact place of history in relation to science, at least they will appreciate the suggestiveness of our author's exhortation to his critics: "Strike, but hear me!"

We have given Mr. Collingwood a patient and lengthy hearing, having spent many hours with his book. At the end we feel that we want to strike him, but a prior necessity is laid upon us—viz., to understand him. No review of his book, however lengthy, could possibly interpret it, or, in fact, do anything except convince people that here is a work of first-rate importance which must be read. When people have read it, let them strike if they dare!

H. Maurice Relton.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER